

HOME DEPARTMENT

NOTES



**REPORT OF THE INDIAN
UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.**

HOME DEPARTMENT.

NOTES.

REPORT OF THE INDIAN UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.

FROM THE SECRETARY, INDIAN UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION, No. 316, DATED 9TH JUNE 1902.

Forwards the Report.

1. I agree with the Report as a whole, and would further remark on it, that it is experimental; that if its recommendations are put into effect, the expenditure of considerable sums of money will be necessary, and that the success of the policy recommended will depend very largely on the initial measures taken by the Government to bring it into effect. The Report is not one which will be brought into effect by the action of the Local Governments alone.

2. In modifying the present type of University, consisting almost entirely in the organization of examinations, and in substituting one which will consist also in the organization of teaching, the Report aims at the emancipation of teaching, which has been unduly constricted, and at reducing to order the institutions and curricula which have suffered from undue license and confusion. At present we have systems and institutions of which the outlines are blurred. The Universities extend their operations beyond their proper sphere; and the colleges and schools mutually overlap. The first object of this Report is to bring this confusion into order and simplicity; and to set up a definite type of education, under definite conditions, which will be recognized as University education; to fix courses of study as definite units, instead of aggregations of subjects for which marks may be obtained, and to provide for proper supervision of those courses of study; then to give the teachers the very widest freedom possible within the limits so laid down. This comment on the Report is perhaps a platitude; but I set it forth because I should not, in the abstract, express concurrence with a Report which contemplates a purely literary course for boys of 15 to 18 or 19, which are the ages between which, as a rule, the students will study for the first two years of the University course. The course of study chosen by the Commission is one which, under present conditions, most colleges are equipped to teach; and the importance of the recognition of the idea of imparting some co-ordinated course of study, under proper conditions of University and College control, takes precedence of the importance of anticipating the improvements in that course of study, which a successful working of the system may itself bring about.

Perhaps a similar remark may apply to the inclusion by the Commission of the study of Psychology in the course universally recommended for these youths.

In dealing with the question of setting up some simple and definite type in place of the present, the Commission were practically confined to a choice between two alternatives: either to centralise the Universities in the Presidency towns, cutting off the out-lying colleges, and converting them into schools, with perhaps here and there a self-governing and degree-granting University college in the Mofussil, or to recommend the retention of the good Mofussil colleges within the constitution of the University, feeling the hand of the University in the rules relating to affiliation, and the administration of those rules by means of inspection. The Commission have taken the latter course, and at the same time have suggested the planting of seed from which a centralised University may hereafter grow. I concur.

3. This administration and inspection is an experiment, upon which the success of the scheme will depend.

But in any case further changes will follow the result of the experiment. The Universities are to have control of education above the standard which an intelligent boy may reach at the age of sixteen, and are to continue to give him a general education for two years, before he begins to specialize for a profession. If the experiment succeeds, and the inspection is efficient, there will at once be some "colleges" which give an education beyond the age of sixteen, but do not reach the University standard, and as there are to be no new second-grade Colleges, a demand may arise for some extension of the secondary school system for the boys who would otherwise, under present circumstances, proceed up to the F.A. stage only. Perhaps these cases might be met by complementary courses, commercial or otherwise, attached to selected secondary schools. Then, as the seed of central University teaching grows, there may be a tendency on the part of students to resort to the University centre, not at the B.A. stage, as now contemplated, but at the F.A., when specialization begins; and thus ultimately the University course proper would be a specialized course, beginning at the age of 18, and given at the centre. If, on the other hand, the Universities prove themselves unequal to the duties which the Commission now propose to entrust to them, of course the problem of bettering the education given in the out-lying colleges will be again thrown on the Government. For these reasons, I am inclined to regard the type of University now proposed as somewhat transitional, and I believe the Commission themselves regard their proposals as experimental, and the best course now available; in which I agree.

4. The Report points out that the proposals will cost money; and the same remark was made by the Commission under Lord Cowper's chairmanship, which reported on the reorganization of the London University. In particular, the inspection of the Colleges, if it is to be

systematised, and is to include the giving of real assistance in the various branches of study, will cost a good deal of money, and is not the kind of object which would appeal to the munificence of private benefactors. The Commission have left this part of the scheme in outline only, as specific recommendations of formal inspection, in manner prescribed by authority, were not likely to do good; but the Syndicates will have to organise it, and organise it with reference to the funds available. I hope that the Government may be able to intimate their readiness to give some financial assistance in the carrying out of the scheme of the Commission, if approved.

5. Mr. Raleigh has expressed a wish to discuss with me the means by which the Government may be hereafter assured of the consistent administration of the new system proposed; and, therefore, I defer any remarks upon this point, and upon the measures by which the initial velocity is to be given to the changes, until I have had the benefit of discussing them with him.

H. W. ORANGE,—28-6-02.

For information. May be submitted to His Excellency.

J. P. HEWETT,—1-7-02.

Yes. I understand that Secretary is awaiting the result of a communication from Honourable Mr. Raleigh to His Excellency before dealing with the Report. (I am not sure that I follow clause 2 of paragraph 3 on page 1 of Director General's note.)

DENZIL I [BBETSON],—2-7-02.

Private Secretary to the Governor-General.

J. P. HEWETT,—3-7-02.

I have read with much pleasure and interest the Report of Mr. Raleigh's Commission. It covers with accuracy and fulness (but with sufficient condensation) the entire ground which we had invited the Commission to traverse. It exposes faithfully, but without undue severity, the defects of the present system. It outlines a scheme of administrative and legislative reform, with the greater part of which I am convinced that the Government of India will be in sympathy, and it testifies to an amount of industry, hardwork, and devotion to duty, on the part of the President and his colleagues, which must have imposed a severe burden upon their energies, and which the Government of India will doubtless seek an early opportunity of acknowledging in suitable terms. If in any parts a note of irresolution or uncertainty be detected, this is in all probability due to the necessities of compromise among a body so variously constituted, and representing such different points of view, and the Government of India will not thereby be disabled from forming an independent judgment and deciding upon its course of action.

2. We have already sent home a copy of the Report to the Secretary of State and have requested his permission to its immediate publication in this country. It will be our duty here (1) to decide in Council whether we advocate legislation for the reconstruction of the Indian Universities on the lines recommended by the Commission; (2) if the answer be in the affirmative, to draft a Bill for the purpose, and (3) to address the Local Governments, probably forwarding to them a draft of the legislation proposed.

3. In order to assist our decision upon these points I note at the present stage; since the Department, in the person of its Secretary, is hardly able to advise us in the ordinary course, Mr. Hewett having himself been a member of the Commission. After I have indicated the points upon which it appears to me that we may reasonably follow, or should depart from, the conclusions of the Commission, the file can then be noted upon in the Home Department and can be circulated to Honourable Members for their opinion, prior to the discussion in Council, which I hope may be taken at no distant date. I will now follow the statements or proposals of the Commission *seriatim* in the order in which they occur in the Report, and I will allude, where necessary, to the Note of Dissent from Mr. Justice Banerjee in connection with those passages of the Report upon which it passes comment or criticism.

4. It is not necessary for me to say anything about the first 20 paragraphs of the Report. They are in the main expository or historical, and they condense in a useful manner information with which we are already familiar.

5. Having pointed out that the Indian Universities, as at present constituted, are a little more than examining Universities, but a good deal less than teaching Universities, the Commission proceed in paragraph 24 to indicate a method by which it might be possible, in their opinion, to associate them more closely with teaching direct. The suggestion is that Central Schools of advanced study may in time be formed, to which the Universities should contribute by the appointment of lecturers, and the provision of libraries, laboratories, and residential quarters, and the colleges by means of scholarships. In paragraph 26 the nature of these schools is more clearly indicated, for Schools of Science, Philosophy, and Literature are mentioned by name. Later on in paragraph 192 it is suggested that they might also find support from private endowments.

In paragraph 121, however, mention is made of a suggested "Central School of Law" at each University, which seems to be something entirely different, and not to fall under the head of the Central Schools of advanced study which I am now discussing. For, in the first place, it is to be established not "*in time*," but "*without delay*," and secondly, it is to take the place of the existing Law classes, and will, therefore, clearly not deal with advanced study alone. We have here a useful illustration of the ambiguity of the title upon which I am about to comment.

6. With regard to these proposals in their wider application, I have to say that they seem to me somewhat shadowy, and to have been introduced rather with the object of showing that it may not be impossible, consistently with the maintenance of the Collegiate system, to make an Indian University a teaching institution in something more than the name, than with any idea that the suggestion is practical, or capable of realisation except in a very remote future. The very name School seems indeed to me to be a misnomer (borrowed perhaps from the use of the term in the older English Universities) and to be likely to cause confusion, since to turn a so-called University into a real University by inviting it to become or to create a school would probably produce bewilderment rather than extend precision. I expect that this recommendation of the Commission may have been one of those plausible suggestions that are sometimes thrown out by an individual Commissioner or witness, and that are apt to be accepted, because no one has thought out very clearly what they mean or how they are to be realized, and because they add to the general symmetry or beauty of a Report without pledging its authors to any very definite suggestion. Perhaps however I may do the Commission an injustice in this respect. In any case Mr. Hewett or Mr. Raleigh, when the file comes to them, will be able to explain, and to inform us whether these Central Schools are anything more than a pious aspiration. It is not clear, either, to what stages of a post-graduate career they are intended to apply: nor from what quarter the Universities are to derive the funds with which to create, endow, or support them.

7. Under the heading, in the Report, of "Teaching Universities" one might have expected to find the view of the Commission as to the steps (apart from the suggestion above mentioned) to be taken for the legal conversion of the older Universities into teaching bodies. Strange to say, there is no mention of the matter at all, beyond the admission in paragraph 21 that there is a very general desire for the enlargement of the existing constitutions; and it is not till we come to paragraph 195 (a) that we find that the Commission do recommend that power to this effect should be taken in a new Bill—advice which is repeated in the Summary of Recommendations on page 57, as the first conclusion to which the Commissioners have come. I agree with this recommendation. Whether the legal power be taken advantage of or not, it is anomalous that it should be possessed by Lahore and Allahabad, and not by Calcutta, Madras and Bombay: and the revocation of the existing restriction in the three latter cases is the first condition of any movement towards the ideal that we probably all have in view. Such a change is further in accordance with Resolution 1 of the Simla Conference of September 1901.

8. Paragraph 27 of the Report is in accordance with a suggestion thrown out by myself on page 9 of my Minute on University Reform, of 23rd February 1901, and with Resolution 24 of the Simla Conference. It will, I have no doubt, be accepted by the Government of India. Greater concentration and centralisation are unquestionably required. Moreover, in the long run they will tend, not towards the suppression, but rather towards the creation, of separate educational institutions at a distance from headquarters. I presume that the suggested changes will not require legislation, but will be effected in consultation with the Local Governments and the Senates. A similar plan would be followed as regards the examination for oriental titles held by the Punjab University at Lucknow. I also agree with the recommendation made in paragraph 28.

9. In paragraphs 29, 30, 31, the Commission deprecate the multiplication, for the present, of Indian Universities. I gave much the same advice when I said, in opening the Simla Conference, that "as time goes on, the list may perhaps be extended, though consolidation, rather than multiplication, of academic institutions, is the object that I should prefer for the present to hold in view." Council will, I am sure, agree with this opinion. The Central Provinces must wait: and the time for Burma is not yet. I gave the reasons in a speech at Rangoon on December 10th, 1901, and I am glad to find that they are corroborated by the Commission. The question of the conversion or expansion of the Mahomedan College at Aligarh into a University need not now trouble us. The Trustees are not in the least likely to get the money.

10. Paragraphs 33—43 relate to the proposed reconstitution of the Senates. The various methods by which this might be effected are mentioned by the Commissioners in paragraph 34, and by Mr. Banerjee in paragraph 3 of his Note of Dissent. We shall, no doubt, agree with the Commission in vetoing what may be called the "lapse of time" method. It stands self-condemned. Both the Commission and Mr. Banerjee speak with similar disapproval of the proposal, representing the other extreme, to repeal the Acts of Incorporation, and to frame new Acts all round; but when Mr. Banerjee describes this proposal (paragraph 3) as being one "that the existing Senates should be dissolved," and says that neither he nor his colleagues are in favour of it, he appears to me to be describing with accuracy exactly what those colleagues have recommended. For their proposal is that the Viceroy or Governor or Lieutenant-Governor should "nominate a new Senate." How he can nominate a new one without dissolving the old one, I fail to understand. He may or may not recruit the new body from the

members of the old body, but to whatever extent he may do so, he is clearly starting *de novo*, and there will be nothing but his own discretion to fetter his choice. I do not think, therefore, even if we retain the existing Acts of Incorporation, and describe our legislation as amending, that we can honestly cherish the illusion that we are doing anything but start with a clean slate.

11. Where Mr. Banerjee differs from the Commission is in this. The Commission propose Senates of 100 (as a maximum) for Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, and 60 for Allahabad and Lahore: and the existing Fellows, whether nominated or elected, will only reappear in the new bodies by the goodwill of the Chancellor. Mr. Banerjee proposes two Senates, an old or unreformed Senate of 250—150, to include all the existing Fellows, and a reformed Senate or new governing body of 100—60. I may point out, in the case of Bombay, where the Senate consists of more than 300 Fellows, that this would mean the postponement of reform in respect of the number of Fellows for years to come; while in the other cases it would rob reform of much of its value. I have, by refusal either to exercise nomination or to allow election for more than two years, succeeded in reducing the Calcutta Fellows to about 175 persons: and I am not in the least likely to throw away this hard-earned advantage by admitting a statutory limit of 250. Upon the question of numbers, therefore, and upon the desirability of having a single Senate, instead of two overlapping bodies, we shall have no difficulty in deciding with the Commission rather than with Mr. Banerjee. We need not at this moment fix upon the exact figures of the Commission. The Simla Conference (Resolution 3) did not contemplate quite so large a reduction, and suggested a maximum of 120—150. I shall presently name certain considerations that favour this rather than a smaller number. Probably when the Report is published, there will be a loud outcry from the Native Press at the drastic proposals of the Committee. We can wait to see what is said before we finally make up our own minds.

12. As to the method of dealing with the already existing Fellows, we may at once reject Mr. Banerjee's proposal that they should all retain their full existing rights; for such a plan is, as I have said, incompatible with any reform. The proposals of the Commission, subject to a very serious criticism that I shall make later on, are on the lines of, though they go somewhat beyond, the recommendations made by me in my Minute of 23rd February 1901. The constituent authority is to reappoint a number of the existing nominated Fellows, distributed in certain proportions according to Faculties, and also "a suitable number of existing elected Fellows, not exceeding $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the whole" (i.e., the whole revised Senate). Those Fellows, whether originally nominated or elected, who are not fortunate enough to secure renomination, are to remain Honorary Fellows (paragraph 41), and to retain such powers of voting as they at present enjoy, except in the Senate itself.

13. Here again I expect that we shall have a considerable outcry, and I would not like to pledge myself, without further consideration, even to the broad outlines of the Commission's plan. It will not in any case be an enviable task for a Chancellor to reduce a body of persons, possessing vested interests, and numbering at present from 175 to 300 at the three older Universities, to a total of less than 100: nor do I particularly envy my own lot in selecting out of the 22 Fellows hitherto elected at Calcutta University, the eight or ten who are most fitted for a continuance of the honour. At Allahabad also there will be some gnashing of teeth: for there are 41 elected Fellows in that University; and if the number of those who are capable of being renominated is limited, as proposed, to a maximum of $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the entire remodelled Senate, i.e., to six persons, the expropriated 35 will probably produce a very articulate sound.

14. I now come to a point upon which the Commission appear to me hardly to have realized the purport of their recommendations, and where I think it likely that we may have to deviate from their advice. I allude to the provision for the election of Fellows in the future. The Commission propose (paragraph 37) that "Fellows of this class shall vacate their places in such a way as to secure regular annual elections in the future." But they have apparently forgotten that under the system of five-years Fellowships, as recommended by them, no elected Fellowships will fall vacant until five years after the introduction of the new system, and therefore not until that time has elapsed, can the elections become either annual or regular. Further, inasmuch as the total number of elected Fellows is to be limited to 10 (i.e., $\frac{1}{10}$ th of 100)—if the Chancellor nominates that number from the start, then they will all cease to be Fellows at the same time, five years later, and it will be impossible to introduce graduated election. There seem to me to be only two alternatives to this *impasse*. Perhaps the Commission may mean that those of the existing elected Fellows whom the Chancellor will nominate to the new Senate should thereby pass into the category of nominated Fellows, and that the electorate should begin from the start to elect two more Fellows per annum. But in that case it will be impossible to observe the Commission's maximum of $\frac{1}{10}$ th of the whole Senate, which has been prescribed in special relation to "the existing elected Fellows," for the two categories of Fellows elected under the two systems, old, and new, must very early exceed the total of 10. The other alternative is that only a fraction of the existing elected Fellows should be admitted, not *en masse*, but at the rate of two per annum from the start, in order to provide for progressive retirement later on. But of this I would say that it is inconsistent with the recommendation of the Commission that "a suitable number of the

existing elected fellows" should be reappointed from the start; that it would mean either re-election of those already elected, or a complete suspension of fresh election for five years—both of which are equally impossible; and that it would be indignantly spurned by public opinion. I think therefore that some much clearer explanation than is contained in the Report is required as to what the Commission really mean about elected Fellows. It must be borne in mind that the privilege has now been in existence for over ten years, and that under it there have been elected 24 Fellows (reduced by death to 22) at Calcutta, 16 at Madras, 18 at Bombay, 41 at Allahabad. The reduction of these totals by a stroke of the pen to a maximum of 10 (and 6 in the case of Allahabad) and, as I have pointed out, a very dubious 10, will cause much and reasonable resentment. It must be explained to us why the Commission have suggested the limit of $\frac{1}{10}$ th. To a body that has hitherto returned from 16 to 24 out of a Senate of 175—200 and that has expected and been allowed year by year to increase this total by 2 or 3, it will be no consolation to return 10, or less than 10, out of a Senate of 100. The Simla Conference, while recommending a Senate of 120—150, also recommended (Resolution 9) "That the total number of elected Fellows should be fixed at an approximate proportion of $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{5}$ of the whole." I expect that we shall find a safer guide in this advice than in that of the Commission.

15. Further, while we are on the subject of five-years Fellowships, will our Commissioners explain how the Chancellor is to deal with the great mass of the re-nominated Fellows, at the termination of the first five years? As they will all go out at the same time, either he must re-appoint the majority (in which case the five-years term will become meaningless) or he will have a brand new Senate. Or does the Commission mean that the re-nominated Fellows are to be there for life, and that only as they die off or disappear will the Chancellor be able to fill vacancies? But in that case we do not get the reform that we desire. Nor is such an explanation consistent with the language of the Report in paragraphs 35, 39 and 41. This again, therefore, is an obscurity that requires to be cleared up.

16. There is another hypothesis which may conceivably have been present to the mind of the Commission, but which a few moments' examination will show to be unrealisable in practice. They may have had in view that both in the case of the old nominated Fellows who are renominated by the Chancellor to the new Senate and of the old elected Fellows who are either re-elected or renominated, the process of annual change should commence from the start, i.e., that the new Senate having been constituted up to its maximum of 100 (10 of whom are to be elected Fellows), 20 of the former (including 2 of the latter) should go out at the end of the first year, the same number at the end of the second year, and so on from year to year, the annual reinvigoration being thus provided for. But if the Commissioners mean this, I must point out that it is entirely inconsistent with their own recommendation (paragraph 39) that "appointments to the new Senates should be for five years" for it would mean in practice that (unless the Chancellor were to renominate all those who went out) some of the Fellowships would be of one, others of two, and others of three and four years' duration. Again it would impose upon the Chancellor a task which I imagine that he would resolutely decline to assume. For it would mean that having been called upon in the first place to select the 100 out of the existing Senate who were fit for a future existence at all, he would then have to divide up these 100 into fresh compartments, according as they were in his opinion fit for an extended existence of one year, two, three, four or five. Such a procedure is obviously out of the question. I repeat therefore that so far as I can see, the Commission have failed to provide us with a solution of the great initial difficulty of how to constitute the new Senates.

17. I revert to the elected Fellows, and to the method proposed by the Commission for their election. As we know, under the present system the electorate at Calcutta consists of M. As. and holders of higher degrees, and of B. As. before 1867 (when the degree of M. A. was introduced). Even with this strict limitation the electorate numbers over 1,500, scattered all about India. In Bombay and Madras the electors are, I believe, graduates of not less than

* *Home Department*,—Please verify or correct.
C[URRON].

"At Madras a Master of Arts or of Law and a Doctor of Medicine of the Madras University of any standing, is permitted to vote: but not a Bachelor of Arts, Law, Medicine, or Civil Engineering unless he is of 20 years' standing. At Bombay all graduates who have obtained the highest existing degree in any Faculty, or who have obtained two degrees, one of which shall be in the Faculty of Arts, or who, having obtained one degree only, are graduates of not less than 10 years' standing, are permitted to vote."

J. P. HEWETT,—23-7-02.

10 years' standing.* At Allahabad and Lahore the electorate is in each case the Senate. Now one would have liked a clear lead from the Commission as to what should be the electorate in the future. If there is a point upon which they might have been expected to advise us, it is this. The Simla Conference (Resolution 10) had no hesitation in declaring "That it is desirable that the electoral body should consist of the graduates of the Universities rather than of the Senates," and (Resolution 11) "That the electoral body

should in all probability be graduates of not less than 10 years' standing." But all that we get from the Commission is (paragraph 37) that "Power may be taken to introduce election by the Senate in the older Universities, or election by graduates at Allahabad and Lahore." Do the Commission mean that it is to be left open by Statute, or do they mean that, as they could not make up their own minds, Government must decide? We who have not heard the evidence should be grateful for some idea of the arguments that were employed in either direction.

18. Hitherto the qualifications of the electors and the elected have been—in the case of Calcutta certainly—identical; i.e., the electors have elected from among themselves. But the Commission (paragraph 40) have introduced a variation, in recommending that "the electors should be graduates of five years' standing, and the persons elected should be graduates

of 10 years' standing." Have they reflected what the former means? I should like figures made out of the numbers of the proposed electorates for the principal Universities. The Commission have said nothing about the method of voting, and therefore I presume that they are in favour of a continuance of the present plan, *i.e.*, election by voting paper with its attendant but inevitable evils of canvassing, etc. Have they considered what this will mean with an electorate, consisting perhaps of several thousands? I confess to entertaining grave doubts as to this part of their scheme. I quite recognize and have myself preached the advantage of sustaining the interest of the graduate body in their University. But when this comes to investing with electoral powers a B. A. of only five years' standing, *i.e.*, a youth of perhaps only 24 or 25 years of age—or rather thousands of these youths throughout India—I feel qualms. Hitherto a B. A. of Calcutta has never been an elector at all (except the dwindling number of pre-67 men). The proposed change will therefore be a Franchise Bill of the widest and most radical dimensions.

19. In paragraph 39 the Commission recommend that all future appointments to the Senate should be made "on the clear understanding that the person appointed undertakes to attend the meetings of the Senate." Excellent so far as it goes—but what meetings, and how many meetings? Is a Fellow to attend all? If he misses one, is he to be disqualified? Or is he to attend so many per annum, and if so, how many and which? Here, as in other cases, the Commission appear to have shrunk from a definite recommendation, and to have left the responsibility for the shoulders of Government. Perhaps however we may receive some explanation in the discussion that will now follow.

20. In the same paragraph it is recommended that power be taken to remove the names of those Fellows who, by change of residence or otherwise, *have ceased* to be able to take part in University attendance. Yes, but when, and how soon? Is the Chancellor to ask a man to resign as soon as he leaves Calcutta (or whatever the centre may be) for some other province or appointment, or is he to wait until a certain time has elapsed, and the Fellow is disqualified by failure to respond to the attendance test, whatever it be. I note that Mr. Banerjee's paragraph 5 (d) would make non-attendance for one year the criterion of disqualification. We shall be grateful for information as to the view of the Commission on this point.

21. I agree generally with the proposal in paragraph 40 that elections from a particular Faculty should be made by the graduates (subject to what I have previously written) in that Faculty. At the end of the same paragraph it is proposed that the Chancellor shall have power to cancel an election if he is convinced, after due enquiry, that there has been improper canvassing. This reference is the only allusion to the method of voting to be employed; and it suggests the inference, as I have previously remarked, that the Commission propose no alteration in this respect. But when they advocate the non-confirmation (it is not a cancellation) of the election of a Fellow upon these grounds, I must make it clear that they are not the only grounds upon which the Chancellor is to be at liberty to withhold his assent. At present the entire prerogative of election being permissive, the Chancellor is at liberty to reject any name that is sent up to him for confirmation, on grounds of personal unsuitability or otherwise. Under the new system he must of course retain this power. It would never do to limit the grounds of disqualification to the use of improper canvassing alone.

22. I agree with the proposals in paragraph 38 about the Director of Public Instruction and the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal: also with those about Honorary Fellows in paragraph 41. When we come to paragraph 42, which relates to the classes from which the remodelled Senates are to be drawn, and when in sub-section C we find a recommendation of "professional gentlemen of high standing, especially those who have received their education in this country," I presume that the reference is to native barristers and *vakils*, and that this clause was introduced to please Mr. Banerjee and his friends. If I am correct, then I would remark that the obligation to introduce this sort of Fellow applies equally to the electors who return the elected Fellows, with the Government; but that it is one which they have hitherto conspicuously ignored. Nor, if I may hazard a prediction, is it one which with a lowered franchise (as recommended by the Commission) are they at all more likely to recognize in the future.

23. We may, I think, accept the recommendations of paragraph 43.

24. I may revert here to Mr. Banerjee's alternative proposal with regard to the point that we have been discussing. I have already said that I regard the proposal of two Senates, *i.e.*, an outer and larger body of Fellows, and an inner and smaller governing body, as impracticable. Mr. Banerjee seems himself to see that it would be both complicated and cumbersome; while the advantages which he claims on its behalf (paragraph 6) appear to me to be either illusory or insidious. Mr. Banerjee's plea in his paragraph 8, which is one for the sufficient representation of Indians (whether possessed of academic qualifications or not) upon the reformed Senates, is of course addressed to his public *clientèle*, and may be taken *cum grano salis*.

25. Generally I think that we may agree in the recommendations in paragraphs 44—47 of the Report. There is no present scope for Faculties of Oriental Learning. The general movement is entirely in the opposite direction, and we are not likely to arrest it by providing

(at considerable cost) opportunities of which but few would take advantage, and which cannot be said to have been successful in the single case in which they have been tried, *viz.*, at Lahore. Similarly, as regards a Faculty of Commerce, the Universities have to justify themselves as purveyors of instruction in the ordinary sense, before they embark upon fresh experiments at present hardly attempted in Europe. A Faculty of Theology is out of the question. As for Natural Religion, it is incapable of being made the basis of an academic curriculum.

26. Paragraphs 48 and 49 of the Report are in accord with Resolution 25 of the Simla Conference, and may be accepted by the Government of India. I may observe, however, that the Simla Resolution 26 "That power should be reserved to Government to prescribe any addition to, or removal from, the list of text-books to be used for University examinations which it may hold to be necessary" finds no place in the recommendations of the Commission, probably for the reason that they did not think it generally incumbent upon them (though the principle has been departed from in several instances) to lay down a rule of guidance for Government. I shall be glad, however, of the opinion of our Commissioners as to whether such a rule is or is not necessary. It was felt at Simla that the power both of introduction and excision is one that Government ought not to forego.

27. Paragraphs 50 and 51 relate to the constitution of the reformed Syndicates. I presume that they represent to some extent (*e.g.*, in respect of the proposed numbers) a compromise between conflicting views. The Government of India will doubtless agree that the Director of Public Instruction should be *ex-officio* a member and Vice-Chairman of the Syndicate. I gather that the proposals of the Commission involve a statutory majority of teachers upon the Syndicates, inasmuch as Mr. Banerjee (paragraph 9) dissents from this conclusion. The statutory recognition of the new Syndicates (paragraph 51 (a)) is clearly desirable; the absence of such recognition in the case of the older Universities being a palpable flaw in the present system. The Simla Conference proposed (Resolution 16) that in any fresh legislation power should be taken by the Governor-General in Council at Calcutta and the Governor in Council at Madras and Bombay to make rules for the future constitution of the Syndicates from the ranks of the Senates. The Commission say nothing about this most important point at the stage of their report which we are now examining. I presume, however, that it is covered by one of their concluding recommendations in paragraph 195 (g), that the Governor-General in Council should be empowered to frame new Regulations for each University, and that he should exercise this power in each case in consultation with the Local Government and the Senate. If I am right, I may add that this seems to me a suitable and appropriate method of procedure.

28. At the conclusion of paragraph 51 the Commission record an opinion that the decisions of the Syndicates in certain specified cases, of which the most important is the affiliation or disaffiliation of Colleges—should not be subject to discussion or revision in the Senates. I imagine the reason to be that these matters might be discussed in the Senates in a not altogether dispassionate spirit, that they might give rise to intrigue and canvassing there, and that a conflict might even be generated between a Senate and a Syndicate, which would be both mischievous and unbecoming. The opposite side of the case has been well stated by Mr. Banerjee in paragraphs 10—12 of his Note of Dissest; and it is one upon which I should like to hear more before pronouncing a final opinion.

29. The passage in the Report just referred to contains the first mention of the subject of affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges under the new regime. The proposals of the Commission, to which I shall come presently, are contained in paragraphs 57, *et seq.* But it is very remarkable that in neither place is there any mention of the final authority or sanction of Government (provided for in Resolutions 17—21 of the Simla Conference); and it is not till we come to the sketch of possible legislation in paragraph 195 (d) and to Mr. Banerjee's note, paragraph 11, that we find it to have been definitely recommended that all proposals, whether for affiliation or disaffiliation, should be submitted, with the Syndicate's opinion, to Government for final orders. We may, I hope, trust the reformed Syndicates to discharge their duty in this connection better than it has been done in the past; but, at the same time, it seems to me most necessary to provide for the ultimate control and responsibility of Government.

30. We shall doubtless accept the proposals contained in paragraphs 52 and 53, concerning the Registrar and Staff.

31. In paragraph 54, the Commission recommend the formation of good reference libraries in connection both with Universities and Colleges. I understand and sympathise with the suggestion in the case of the Colleges. But until the Universities have a local habitation (other than a Convocation Hall), where are their libraries to be, who is to keep them up, and by whom will they be used? For instance, the Calcutta University consists in a concrete sense, so far as I know, only of a single large Hall. The Report says "Calcutta has a library"; but whether this means the University, or where the library is located, we are not told. At a later stage of the Report (paragraph 80) the suggestion is expanded, and we read that "the University might establish a reference library, with Reading and Conference Rooms for Professors, and rooms in which students might read and hold debates." This again rather puzzles me, for, as I understand, both pupils and Professors are engaged throughout the day at their respective Colleges and, apart from the great expense of erecting these buildings on a central site, I do not see who would profit by them except those

students or lecturers who happened to be living in the neighbourhood. Generally speaking, the proposal for libraries and meeting rooms is one with which we may feel warm sympathy, but I think that I should be inclined to place the needs of Colleges before those of the Universities, and I should be grateful for further explanation on the latter point.

32. The first suggestion in paragraph 55—for a register of graduates, subject to an annual fee, is in accordance with Simla Resolution 15, and may be accepted. The second proposal that the Senates shall be empowered to remove from the register the name of any graduate convicted of a discreditable offence was also foreshadowed by Simla Resolution 40, and may be similarly endorsed. The two-thirds rule seems to be reasonable and sound.

33. I pass to the important question of affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges. Here the report of the Commission has not perhaps stated the case in the clearest possible way, although I think that, upon investigation, we shall find in it all that we desire. The Simla Conference stated succinctly in Resolution 18 what were the various tests to which a College should conform before affiliation is granted. If we examine the Report, we shall find that they reappear in a slightly different guise in the following passages :

- (i) *Para. 57 (1).*—Desirability of the institution to be certified by the Director of Public Instruction.
- (ii) *Ibid.*—Assurance as to financial stability.
- (iii) *Para. 61.*—Creation of a properly constituted governing body.
- (iv) *Para. 62.*—Provision of an adequate teaching-staff with a common room for their meetings.
- (v) *Para. 63.*—Provision of suitable and healthy buildings.
- (vi) *Ibid.*—Where possible (though of course this cannot be made a condition of affiliation) residence by the Principal and Professors in close proximity to the College. This is identical with Simla Resolution 45.
- (vii) *Para. 66.*—Adequate provision for the residence of students in College lodgings or in hostels (*vide* Simla Resolutions 41 and 42), and for their supervision by a resident superintendent (Simla Resolution 43). At Simla (Resolution 44) we recommended that “as far as possible, hostels attached to Colleges should be subjected to European management or regulation.” The Commission have not gone so far as that. Possibly they regarded it as a counsel of perfection. Their advice in respect of hostels is summed up towards the end of paragraph 68: “In course of time we trust that the provision of quarters for all students not residing with parents or guardians may be made one of the conditions of affiliation, at least for new Colleges.” Personally I hope that we shall not cease to press it equally upon the old.
- (viii) *Paragraph 69.*—Satisfactory guarantees as to subjects and courses of study (e.g., number of lectures, sufficiency of tutorial staff, and provision of a library and laboratories).
- (ix) *Paragraphs 71—75.*—Introduction of a scale of minimum fees, free-studentships being as a general rule debarred, and State and private scholarships encouraged. These proposals are in complete accordance with Simla Resolutions 55—60. They may be attacked by the Native Press and by the managers of private institutions ; but they are *vita*.
- (x) *Paragraph 76.*—Existence and enforcement of proper transfer rules.
- (xi) *Paragraph 77.*—No new second grade Colleges to be affiliated (compare Simla Resolution 23).

These, as I understand, are the conditions which the Commission would prescribe for the affiliation of Colleges in the future. Generally speaking, I think that we shall be prepared to accept them. Certainly they do not err on the side of leniency : and public opinion may perhaps urge us to modification in some particulars. Upon a few of these tests I would add the following comments.

34. There is one respect in which the Commission do not seem to me to have spoken with a very clear sound. I allude to disaffiliation. The Simla Conference laid down most explicitly (Resolution 20) “that, in the event of failure to conform to any of the tests under which affiliation has been granted, it should be in the power of the Syndicates to recommend the withdrawal of the privilege of such affiliation, or of the Governor-General in Council or Local Government, as the case may be, to direct such withdrawal.” The Commission would appear to have provided for a similar procedure, when they say [paragraph 57 (2)] “that no institution, once admitted, be allowed to fall below the standard of efficiency required for affiliation”—that standard, as I have already pointed out, being fixed by no fewer than 11 independent tests. If no College is to be allowed to fall below the standard in any of these particulars, it can only be by the menace

of a definite penalty, and that penalty can only be disaffiliation. That the exercise of this power is contemplated has been shown by the passage previously quoted, in paragraph 51, in which the Commission have deprecated the discussion by the Senate of any such decision on the part of a Syndicate : and also by a passage in paragraph 77 in which disaffiliation "at comparatively short notice" is recommended for second-grade Colleges that fail to comply to the required standard. It is therefore with some surprise that I read in paragraph 59 that "disaffiliation is an extreme penalty, rarely inflicted." If it is only to be rarely inflicted, I would like to know how we are to keep the Colleges (who will at once begin to fall away) up to the mark, or whether the Commission have any other form of check or threat in view. They have very wisely provided [paragraphs 57 (2) and 58] for inspection by the Syndicates (compare Simla Resolution 21) : but if the inspections are to be efficacious, the bodies who conduct them must clearly be invested with a sanction superior to that of mere expostulation or admonition.

35. The Simla Conference similarly gave a very definite lead in respect of temporary or probationary affiliation. Resolution 19 provided "that it should be in the power of the Syndicates in recommending affiliation, or of the Governor-General in Council or the Local Government, as the case may be, in giving sanction to such affiliation, to recommend or to sanction it for a probationary period." It is only, so to speak, by a side-wind, and seemingly half un-aware, that the Commission would appear to have introduced into their report the same advice. It will be found in an almost casual interjection into the opening sentence of paragraph 69 : "We recommend that affiliation should be granted *and from time to time renewed*, not in general terms, but with a more exact reference to the subjects and courses of study for which the College can make adequate provision." Here there is a double ambiguity. Do the Commission mean that all affiliation should be probationary (otherwise how can it be from time to time renewed) ? and if so, why have they not told us the duration of the successive periods of probation ? When they say that the probation is to be determined by a more exact reference to subjects and courses of study, do they mean that it is to be dependent upon that test alone, and not upon the remaining ten ? Surely at the termination of the period the College must be tested by its conformity to all the tests, not to one. It seems to me that we want a much clearer pronouncement on the subject than is at present contained in the Report.

36. Mr. Banerjee (paragraphs 13—15) has entered a forcible protest against the recommendation of the Commission in respect of a minimum fee: and it is worthy of our close attention, because it will doubtless suggest the line of attack that will be followed by the entire native party. I incline personally to the view of the Commission. I have little doubt that fees have been recklessly cut down, to the detriment both of the Colleges that provide the education and of the pupils who receive it. Mr. Banerjee says that we must not exclude the poor student. The answer is that a student so poor as not to be able to pay any minimum fee that is at all likely to be fixed, is not fit to undertake a University course at all. He further says: "Do not raise the college fee, but raise the qualification for entering a college." I presume that by this he means "make the Entrance or Matriculation Examination stiffer." And yet, if such a proposal were made, I venture to predict that among its stoutest opponents would be those for whom Mr. Banerjee speaks. The whole question however of a minimum fee is one upon which we shall doubtless take the advice of Local Governments. Its solution must largely depend upon the conditions of the various provinces, as to which the Commission have heard the evidence and I have not. For instance, I do not know how far the underselling, alluded to in paragraph 72 of the report, has been carried elsewhere than in Bengal. In fixing a minimum fee, if we do, we shall of course be exposed to the charge that we are shutting the doors of Higher Education against the poor, and making it the prerogative of the well-to-do.

37. Mr. Banerjee similarly protests (paragraphs 16—19) against the veto upon transfers proposed by the Commission (paragraph 76). His arguments appear to me to be singularly weak, and to be unlikely to impress the Government of India. Free transfer, by which is meant the ability of a boy to skip about from college to college (one institution being thus at liberty to compete with and to steal away the boys from another) must be thoroughly bad both for the boys and the colleges, and is incompatible either with efficiency or discipline. I therefore support the Commission in disallowing it.

38. It is similarly in the interests of what we may describe as cheap Bengali education that Mr. Banerjee (paragraphs 20—23) disagrees with the proposals of the Commission in paragraph 77 of their Report to discourage and gradually suppress second-grade Colleges. These Colleges are for the most part frauds. They are high schools masquerading under the name and guise of Colleges, simply in order to keep their boys a little longer, and to put more money into their own pockets. The Commission appear to me to be right in exposing and denouncing this deception. Mr. Banerjee's defence of these institutions is, in my opinion, feeble. All he has to say in favour of the truncated system under which they teach up to the Intermediate or F. A. Examination, is that the Universities recognize the latter as a qualifying standard for admission to courses in Medicine and Engineering. The Government of India will probably not be captivated by the learned judge's counter proposal in paragraph 23 of his Note of Dissent, to keep alive such poor first-grade Colleges as are unable to conform to the required standards, by providing them with laboratories at the expense of the University chest. On the other hand, discrimination will

probably require to be exercised in selecting the Colleges to which the process of unhappy despatch is to be applied. I observe that the *Bengalee* says: "There are 32 such second-grade Colleges affiliated to the Calcutta University. Most of these are in the interior of Bengal, and supply a great want. They form important centres of intellectual culture throughout the province, bring education to the door of the middle classes of the mofussil who are unable to send their boys to Calcutta, or are unwilling to do so until the boys are of sufficient age, and exercise an elevating influence upon the people of the locality and surrounding country." I daresay there is a good deal of fustian in this. But we must be on our guard against over-centralisation.

39. In paragraph 78 the Commission recommend that in the future recognition of schools by the Universities (in so far as this continues to be required) the latter should be guided by the Education Department. Mr. Banerjee (paragraphs 31—32) says that in the case of unaided private schools this would be unfair, because it would amount to an undue interference with their freedom of action, and would tend to reduce the school education of each province to a dead level of uniformity. This plea of course will take in nobody. If these schools are to be at liberty to send up their boys to the University Entrance Examination, it is irrational to say that any exercise of University control is an interference with private freedom. It is, on the contrary, an indispensable check upon private license. As for the dead level of uniformity, I doubt if this is more than a phrase. Some uniformity of standard is precisely what is required. It is because, low as that standard at present is, the private schools fall below it, that an effort to bring them up to the level is necessary. As he proceeds Mr. Banerjee seems himself to see how requisite such interference is; and his fiery protest dwindles away into the suggestion that while the Director of Public Instruction must clearly be the referee in the matter, the Syndicate should consider his advice, instead of being bound to adopt it: and that the act of recognition or the reverse should thus be the act of the University rather than of the Department. Perhaps our Commissioners will advise us whether there is any objection to this. I can hardly believe that any Syndicate, reconstituted as it will be, would reject the advice of a Director of Public Instruction in such a matter, and it is of course desirable as far as possible to keep the Education Department in the background.

40. Paragraph 79 of the report is in consonance with Simla Resolution 140 (e). Upon the institution of libraries, recommended in paragraph 80, I have already commented.

41. We now come to the remarks of the Commission upon the present and proposed Courses of Study and Examinations; and here I hope to be more brief. With the observations in paragraph 83 about the study of English we shall be in entire agreement. The concluding sentences of that paragraph are indeed a reflection of Simla Resolutions 88 and 68. With a view to raising the general quality of the knowledge of English required for the Entrance Examination, the Commission consider it undesirable that English text-books should be prescribed. Mr. Banerjee, paragraphs 24—26, emphatically dissents from this conclusion. The subject is one that is capable of being strongly argued on both sides. Personally I am not much impressed with Mr. Banerjee's reasoning (about which I am never free from the suspicion that he is holding a brief for the poorer and unworthier class of Bengali student, whom we want politely to suppress); and the fact that the Commission, who hold the opposite view, consisted so largely of persons themselves engaged in teaching, should compel us, I think, to attach much weight to their recommendation.

42. Paragraphs 86 and 87 will carry our general assent. Paragraph 88 relates to the study of Latin. I confess to being very doubtful whether Latin should be maintained at all. The considerations that render its study so important in Europe, do not apply, or apply with immeasurably less force, in India. The Commission admit that the number of students who offer it is small, that even in Calcutta the lowest standards do not attract more than a very few candidates, that these are believed to learn it only by rote, and that so great is the division of labour and waste of force that some form of inter-collegiate teaching is desirable in the future. My inclination would be to go a step further and to exclude Latin from the lower University Examination. Of course if an Indian graduate is going on to Oxford or Cambridge, he must have the opportunity of taking it up at some period of his University course. Perhaps our Commissioners will inform and advise us further on this point.

43. I have no dissent to offer to paragraphs 89—93.

44. Paragraphs 94—99 contain the views of the Commission on the subject of the vernaculars. They are, I think, apposite and sound. It is proposed—

- (a) *Paragraph 96.*—That every boy on the completion of his school course should be required to pass a reasonably stiff examination in his own language (compare Simla Resolution 64).
- (b) *Paragraph 95.*—That vernacular composition should be made compulsory in every stage of the B. A. course.
- (c) *Paragraphs 86, 94 and 95.*—That the vernacular languages should be introduced (as already done at Bombay) in combination with English as a subject for the M. A. Examination.

I shall not be surprised if these proposals meet with some criticism from the native party : for it is a curious feature, indicative of the purely utilitarian point of view from which education is apt to be regarded by Young India, that the defence and custody of the vernaculars are safe only in English hands. In my view the Commission are right. To give a boy a poor smattering of English at the expense of his native tongue is a serious error : and in this respect our policy ought to be conservative. I am not competent to pronounce any opinion upon the Punjab system, discussed in paragraphs 97—100. No doubt the views of the Commission will be communicated to and will be reported upon by the Punjab Government later on.

45. Paragraph 100, about European modern languages, is rather hesitating. The argument would appear to justify a direct proposal that these languages should not be included in the B. A. course : but the Commission have stopped just short of a definite recommendation. I would certainly exclude these languages. When we have the utmost difficulty in piecing into our mosaic the requisite amount of study of English, of the vernaculars, and of the classical languages of the East, it seems to me, as I have before hinted, a mistake to introduce Latin, French, or German as well. It is true that a Babu engineer with a smattering of French, greeted me at Manipur with a triumphal arch, on which were inscribed the mottoes, *Bon jour* and *Bon soir* ; but this is the only instance known to me in this country in which a knowledge of that language by a native has been turned to practical account.

46. In paragraph 101 the Commission lay down what they think should be the compulsory subjects for the Intermediate or F. A. course. The first three are to be English, a classical Language, and Mathematics. The fourth is to be Physics and Chemistry for those who intend to pursue a scientific curriculum, Deductive Logic and Elementary Psychology for those who do not. With all respect I deprecate this advice. I would greatly prefer to substitute History for Logic and Philosophy. History is already compulsory everywhere in the Entrance or Matriculation Examination ; and it is also compulsory in the Intermediate course (paragraph 106) in Madras and Bombay. It is optional at Calcutta, Allahabad, and Lahore. The Commission hold (paragraph 106) that it cannot be included in the Intermediate course without overburdening it, and that in the B. A. course it should be optional in all Universities. This will mean that after the Entrance Examination, History will, except at the choice of the pupil, cease to be studied at all. Surely this would be a great mistake. If there is a subject which an Indian boy should be encouraged and even compelled to learn, it appears to me to be History. Deductive Logic will never enable him to draw correct deductions as to British rule in India. History will or at least may. Elementary Psychology is all very well in its way, but its educative influence is not to be compared with that of History. There is no need, as the Commission apprehend, to overburden the Intermediate course. Cut out the Elementary Logic and Philosophy proposed by them, substitute History, and the thing is done. Perhaps our Commissioners will amplify their views on this point.

47. The remaining questions discussed in paragraphs 102-4 will be legitimate subjects of discussion with the several Universities. It is unnecessary to comment upon them here. The same applies to paragraph 105 about Mathematics. If they are to be retained as a compulsory subject in the Intermediate or F. A. course, I hope that the tests may not be too severe. It must be remembered that while Mathematics are defended in the report as "an excellent mental training," there are many minds, not necessarily of an inferior order, so constituted as to be unable to derive from them any training at all.

48. The Commission advocate the continued combination of Political Economy with History. I remain unconvinced. Without going so far as Mr. Bowles who, in a recent debate in the House of Commons, described Political Economy as "a dismal conglomerate of pretentious platitudes," I very much doubt whether that science, as taught from the sort of text-books that I have seen, and as exemplified in the sort of examination papers that appear in the Indian University Calendars, can do an atom of good to a single Indian student. These, however, are perhaps heterodox views.

49. The Commission do not appear (paragraph 108) to have made up their minds about Geography. I would as cheerfully and confidently substitute Geography for Political Economy, as I would History for Psychology and Logic.

50. We next come to the study of Science. Here let me record the most uncompromising assent to the first proposition of the Commission (paragraph 109), viz., "that an examination in Science should form no part of the test for admission to the University course." Science as taught in the schools can, with the existing mechanical appliances of the schools and the existing mental appliances of the teachers, be little better than a farce. I have no objection to Physics and Chemistry (paragraph 110) as an alternative fourth subject in the F. A. for those who are proceeding to a scientific degree. I should greatly deprecate their being made compulsory for all. With the remaining proposals in paragraphs 112—116 as to the later scientific courses and examinations, we shall, I think, generally agree.

51. Paragraphs 118—122 contain the recommendation of the Commission for better and more scientific Law-teaching in the future. I gladly endorse their opening proposition (paragraph 119) that Law study ought to be postponed until the student has finished his course in Arts. Upon the proposal to establish Central Schools of Laws I have already commented, but not in a sense at all hostile to the suggestion. Mr. Banerjee (paragraphs 27—30) strenuously opposes it in the interests which I have previously described. I have little doubt that the Law-teaching in the Calcutta Colleges of which he speaks is of an inferior standard, and that it is merely supplied there on the *omnium gatherum* principle under which those institutions are managed. When he says that “no Central College, however well managed, can conveniently accommodate or efficiently teach such a large number of students,” I imagine the answer to be that the proposed Central School would be not so much a complete substitute as a model, and that if the present number of Law students were diminished, no one would be the loser. I think, however, that our Commissioners require to be a little more explicit. Is it only the abolition of Law classes at private and Mofussil Colleges, maintained there, for the most part, I believe, in order to provide funds with which to run the Art classes, that they have in view? Or do they recommend the extinction of existing unsatisfactory Law Colleges in the Mofussil? Both suggestions will be equally unpopular, and will be equally resisted by the Native party. But they appear to me to be of different merit and value. It is reasonable, I think, to interfere with and prevent any form of Law-teaching that can be shown either to teach bad Law, or to teach Law badly. But it may not be equally reasonable to centralize all Law-teaching, at great cost and inconvenience to the student, in the capital. There are, I believe, Law Colleges at Dacca, Barisal, Bankipur and Bhagalpur. Will these come under the head of “centres of *bond fide* legal teaching” (paragraph 122)? I should have thought that it would be better policy to raise the standard of provincial institutions, rather than suppress them altogether.

52. Upon the proposals with regard to Medical courses and degrees (paragraphs 123—140), I have not much to say. I agree with the recommendation at the end of paragraph 123 to separate the offices of Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Examiner to Government; and with that at the end of paragraph 124 to provide proper hostels for the students at the Medical Colleges in the three Presidency towns. The remarks in paragraph 126 are a delicate hint to Government, which may be appropriately borne in mind by those whom it concerns. The remaining suggestions in this section of the Report appear to me to be sound. But I am hardly competent to express an opinion upon them, and they will no doubt come under discussion with the Local Governments.

53. As regards Engineering (paragraphs 141—5), the passages that appeal most to me are the recommendations (paragraph 141) that the Intermediate Examination should in future be the preliminary qualification in all Universities, and (paragraph 145) that further provision is required for instruction in Mining and Electrical Engineering. This is one of the needs of the near future.

54. The paragraphs (146—8) about Agriculture are generally sound (compare the Simla Resolutions 114—116); but the subject hardly came within the purview of the Commission and the less it is mixed up at the present stage with the Indian Universities, in my opinion, the better. We are shamefully behindhand in the Agricultural Education which we provide in this country. But Government has not been wholly responsible: neither will the blot be cured by University diplomas or degrees. We are already, I believe, in communication with Local Governments on the subject.

55. Paragraphs 149—151. The Commission are equally sound, though equally vague, about Commercial Teaching. The policy of Government was laid down in Simla Resolutions 72—75. The Universities can help to some extent in the matter: but it is not one upon which we require to issue new laws, or in which we can do much more than encourage the Universities to proceed upon the lines that have been opened out. In paragraph 21 I have already deprecated Faculties of Commerce at the present stage. It is curious to note that the Commission say nothing about the Punjab University which has, if I remember right, gone ahead of other Universities in this respect by holding examinations of its own in commercial subjects. The Commission quote the Universities of California, Chicago, New York, and Pennsylvania as doing likewise. But they would seem to have overlooked the example at their doors. I am far from saying that, though an interesting, it has proved a successful, experiment.

56. In paragraphs 152—5 the Commission give their views about the training of teachers. I am glad to hear that they were favourably impressed by such Training Schools as they visited; but it would be useful to know, with a view to the necessary action, what were the “certain provinces in which the number of Training Schools was much smaller than is desirable” (paragraph 153). It is also rather remarkable that, after eulogising the Central Training College at Madras and describing it as having effected (in conjunction with the University examinations) a marked improvement in the school teaching in the Presidency (paragraph 154), they end up, not with a recommendation for more of such colleges elsewhere (which would seem to be the natural corollary), but only with the proposal that those Universities which do not grant a license in teaching should introduce it and that they might provide suitable courses of lectures for teachers. Have our Commissioners no advice to give us about Training Colleges in general? May I call their attention to Simla Resolutions 66 and 67?

57. The next subject touched upon in the Report is that of Examinations. We shall agree with the Commissioners in the contents of paragraph 156; and also in the proposal to abolish the previous Examination at Bombay (paragraph 157). This was foreshadowed by Simla Resolution 31. I am also strongly in favour of a four years' B.A. course (paragraph 158). Considering the immaturity of the average candidate when he matriculates, and the amount that he is expected or supposed to absorb before he takes his degree, four years are by no means too long a period to spend in the chrysalis stage, ere he acquires his wings and begins to fly.

58. In paragraph 159 the Commission, in the interests of uniformity of nomenclature (*vide* Simla Resolution 31), propose that the three University Examinations shall in future be called Matriculation Examination, Intermediate Examination, and Examination for B. A. or B. Sc. With the advantages of uniformity we shall all agree. But I am not convinced that the choice recommended is the best. The Intermediate Examination is commonly known as the F. A.; and there seems to be some merit in a nomenclature that reduces so polysyllabic a title to one of two letters. In the same way Matriculation Examination (which cannot for obvious reasons be condensed into M. A.) is perhaps inferior as a title to Entrance Examination, which is capable of being curtailed into E. A. In our English Universities the same passion for abbreviation is evident in the practice that has substituted the popular designation of Smalls for Responsions, Mods for Moderations, and Greats for the Final School in *Literæ Humaniores*.

59. In paragraphs 160—2 the Commission lay their finger upon one of the weakest spots in the existing system, *viz.*, the inadequacy of the Entrance Examinations as a test of fitness for a University career. The large percentage of unsuccessful candidates, viewed in relation to the notorious ease of the standard imposed, is a sufficient proof of failure. The Commission (paragraph 163) first discuss the fixing of an age-limit for Matriculation. The age of 16 has recently been prescribed at Allahabad, and was formerly the rule at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. The Commission, however, recommend a minimum limit of 15, mainly on the ground that, if 16 were adopted, a medical student would not be able to obtain his degree or diploma until he was 23. Apparently (paragraph 164) the Commission were divided on this point. For my own part, until I hear the arguments, I am disposed to express a decided preference for 16; and to urge that the convenience of the medical student should not be permitted to override the educational interests of the students at large. At Simla we discussed this matter, and arrived unanimously at the conclusion (Resolution 27) "that it is generally desirable that the age-limit of 16 should be applied to candidates for the Entrance Examinations of all Universities." One of the greatest difficulties with which we are confronted in India is the natural precocity of the Indian youth; and our system up to date has tended to aggravate rather than diminish it. We now have an opportunity of giving the pendulum a backward swing; and it seems to me that it would be a pity not to take it. I cannot think that a boy of 15 is at all qualified to enter upon a University course, assuming that the latter is to be at all worthy of the name. If he may enter at 15, he may be a B. A. at 19, and B. As. of 19 are, I submit, a breed that ought not to be encouraged. I should like therefore to guard myself from adherence to this section of the Report.

60. Paragraphs 166—8 are devoted to a discussion of the rules regarding private students, who have already been alluded to at the close of paragraph 78. The Commission say that the results of the practice of admitting these students to the Entrance Examination are especially bad at Madras and Bombay. My recollection of the Simla discussion (*vide* Resolution 29) is that the practice has been carried to worse extremes, though perhaps on a smaller scale, in the Punjab than elsewhere; and a similar conclusion is hinted at in the concluding words of paragraph 168. If I remember right, no qualifying tests are required in the Punjab at all. The proposals for restriction made by the Commission seem to me to be sound. I am a little puzzled, however, at the recommendation in paragraph 168 that the decision whether a private student is to be admitted to the F. A. or to the B. A. or B. Sc. examinations is to rest with the Senate. Why the Senate rather than the Syndicate? If we were dealing with the old unreformed Syndicates, I could understand the objection. But if our Syndicates are to be reconstituted in the manner proposed, why should they be unfitted to discharge this modest responsibility? Is it supposed that, having a majority of teachers of recognized institutions upon their roll, their impartiality will be unequal to the strain? There would seem to be a certain inconsistency in laying down, as the Commission have done in paragraph 51, that "exemptions from examination rules," authorised by the Syndicates, should not be reviewed by the Senates, and then (paragraph 168) that admission of private students to the examinations (which is a form of exemption from ordinary rules) should only be authorised by the Senates, and not by the Syndicates.

61. The question discussed in paragraph 169 of the Report, *viz.*, the recognition of the Entrance Examination as a test for Government Service is one that lies rather on the border line of the Commission's reference: for of course the responsibility rests with Government to apply such tests as it may think desirable. The Commission, however, are no doubt right in pointing out that the stream of candidates for this particular examination is considerably swollen by the official openings to which it may lead, and would proportionately shrink if the Government decided to employ some other test. Very likely too the University incomes would suffer by any such change. Indeed, one of the main difficulties that we shall

experience in carrying out some of the Commission's recommendations will be that by reducing the number of persons who enter and who pass the College examinations, we shall seriously impoverish the Universities, and shall render it impossible for them, without Government assistance, to continue their present work, much more to embark upon the extended sphere of activity that is commended to them. The whole question of examinations for Government Service was debated at length in the Simla Conference; and Resolutions 134-139 enshrine the results. We did not feel it possible or desirable to abolish school and college examinations altogether as the test; but we recommended that if a School Final Examination were to be adopted everywhere as the termination of a school career, distinct from and to a certain extent in substitution for the University Entrance Examination [*vide* Simla Resolution 53 (e)], the Government might then utilise the School Final as a convenient test for the middle grades of Government Service. The Commission "looking at the matter solely as it concerns the advancement of learning" (paragraph 170) unhesitatingly advocate the deposition of the Entrance Examination and the substitution of some other test. In other words, they strongly endorse the decision of the Simla Conference.

62. Upon the feasibility of instituting a Universal School Final (which would be, as they point out in paragraph 170, outside the purview of the Universities) the Commission, regarding the matter as one that more immediately concerns the Government, have spoken in less emphatic terms. In order to reduce the number of examinations, they would seemingly prefer an examination that served both purposes, *viz.*, that of a School Final and that of a University Entrance. Such a hybrid is, I fear, likely to go beyond the resources of our creative ingenuity; but I quite agree with the Commission that it would be a good thing if we could persuade the Universities to accept the School Final as a partial test, to be supplemented by such other more strictly academic tests as they might require. This is what we recommended at Simla in Resolutions 53 (e) and 71. I believe that the Local Governments have been consulted on the matter; but I have not seen their replies. Mr. Banerjee in his Dissent (paragraphs 33-4) appears to agree that one examination at this stage would be better than two. But he claims that, if so, it should be the Matriculation and not the School Final. His arguments are (1) that in the other case all schools will come under the control of the Education Department (since the latter would manage the School Final Examination)—a situation which inspires him with great alarm; and (2) that if the Matriculation Examination is reduced in popularity or importance, the Universities will lose a large portion of their fees. The Government of India in deciding the matter will require to balance these considerations, of which the second is material and the first to some extent partisan, against the general advantage to education that may be expected to result from a reduction in the swarm of unqualified candidates who now rush to the Matriculation desks.

63. I have nothing to say upon paragraphs 171-2 except that I agree with the proposal to raise the standard for a pass in the Matriculation Examination (compare Simla Resolution 32). It will no doubt create a good deal of heart-burning: but I note with interest that it is not opposed by Mr. Banerjee, though, as I have remarked in paragraph 36 of the present note, we shall not be saved thereby from the denunciation of his clients.

64. Paragraph 173 records a very important, though somewhat hesitating, opinion on the part of the Commission against the introduction or continuance of an Honours Course. The reason given seems to me to be inadequate, *viz.*, that in Calcutta it has depreciated the pass degree of B. A. Why should it not? The more the pass degree is depreciated, the more will men go in for the Honours Course, which is the very thing that we want to encourage. The Commission say that if the experiment is abandoned at Calcutta, it will then be necessary to raise the standard of the Pass Examination. No doubt it will. But why raise the standard all round (thereby provoking a great outcry) unless we are convinced upon the merits of the case that a B. A. is already too cheaply engendered—instead of maintaining and encouraging the distinction between the ambitious and the duffer, which it is the object of all education to promote? When we discussed the matter at Simla, though the Madras representatives were rather in favour of an easy B. A., we nevertheless came to the unanimous conclusion (Resolution 34) "that the general result of an Honours School is to raise the standard in the higher courses of University Education, and that it is desirable, where this can be shown to be the case, and where it is possible to provide the requisite staff, that Honours Courses should, as time proceeds, be instituted." I admit that this was a cautious and tentative pronouncement; and that it would not justify us in forcing an Honours Course upon a University that did not desire it. But it is a very different thing to abandon one that has already been started, and before this is done more information ought to be at our disposal. The suggestion that the M. A. Examination should be regarded as the Honours School is all very well for those who pass on to it. But these, as we know, are only a small minority; and why should the B. As., who mean to go no further, all be huddled together in one pen, if there is a desire among any of their number to lift themselves above the ruck?

65. The next point upon which I need comment is the recommendation in paragraph 178 that the present rule by which teachers are prohibited from examining in the subjects that they teach should be abrogated. The abuses that might arise from such a permission would no doubt be to some extent mitigated by the proposal to associate an examiner with a board

when his own pupils appeared before him in the examination. But I do not think that they would disappear ; and for my own part I am inclined to agree with Mr. Banerjee's reasoning in paragraphs 35—8 of his Dissent. I can certainly aver, from my own experience, that it is an advantage to a particular student or batch of students to be examined by their own teacher, however scrupulous and honorable as an examiner he may be ; and in India, where everything is committed to memory, and where, as it is, an unenviable amount of fraud admittedly enters into the University examinations, it appears to me to be most important that no loophole should be given either for suspicion of unfair advantage or for the unnecessary encouragement of purely mnemonic tests.

66. I am doubtful of the policy of requiring a candidate to pay a fee in order to see the marks that he has obtained. I suppose the idea to be that, if he has failed, he may not unreasonably desire to know in what subjects he has broken down, so as to make amends next time. Is this the explanation ? And if so, is there known to the Commissioners any place where such a system prevails ? I dare say there is ; and even if not, I would not therefore condemn it : but I think that a little more explanation is required.

67. Paragraph 187. Is it proposed that any limit should be placed to the number of times in which a candidate may appear at an examination posterior to the Matriculation ? I say ' posterior ', because in paragraph 165 it has already been recommended that no one shall be allowed to enter for Matriculation more than three times. I presume that there is no desire to fetter the liberty of the older student, and that he may, if he wishes, go on struggling to become a B. A. until he is a septuagenarian.

68. Paragraph 191. I presume that this is a hint, if not a positive recommendation, to the Calcutta University, to raise its fees. I can see no ground for the present disparity between its charges and those of Madras and Bombay : and I should welcome a move in the direction suggested. In education, as in other branches of production, the cheap is frequently the nasty.

69. There is, in my view, great force in the concluding recommendations of the Commission with regard to the provision of funds. The changes proposed by them, if carried out in anything approaching entirety, will impose upon the Universities fresh burdens, at the same time that they will probably reduce some of their existing sources of revenue. Private individuals may come to the rescue ; though I am not very hopeful about this in a community that likes talking better than giving. But in any case an obligation will be entailed upon Government to provide the Universities and Colleges, in some measure, ~~with the machinery~~ for carrying out the reforms which we shall dictate to them : and I may add that the antagonism to these reforms, which in many cases will be great, will be sensibly alleviated if it be seen that Government is not only a virtuous but a munificent despot.

70. May I call the attention of Mr. Raleigh and Mr. Hewett to Simla Resolutions 2, 33, 35 and 39 ? They relate to subjects which, unless I am mistaken, have not attracted the attention of the Commission, or at least (with the exception of a passing reference to inter-collegiate teaching in paragraph 88) do not figure in the Report. Paragraph 174 of the latter relates to a different though cognate subject.

71. Will they also tell me which, if any, of the enormous pile of volumes recording the supplementary labours of the Commission, I ought to look into or to study ?

72. I will defer giving any more detailed advice upon the general action to be taken upon the Report, until I have received the replies of Mr. Raleigh and Mr. Hewett. But, as I said in paragraph 7 of this note, I entertain no doubt that we ought and shall be obliged to legislate. We may perhaps be able to introduce a Bill during the forthcoming winter session at Calcutta ; but that we shall have any real prospect of passing it into law in a session already busily crowded (so far at least as Mr. Raleigh is concerned) and certain to be much broken into by the Delhi festivities is, I think, most problematical. More probably it will be our chief business in the session of 1903-04.

C[URZON],—20-7-02.

1. The "irresolution" which His Excellency has observed in some parts of the Report is due to the representative character of the Commission. Our choice often lay between a qualified sentence which all were able to accept and a more definite statement which would have given occasion for notes of dissent. All such notes detract from the authority of the Report as a whole.

2. In paragraph 24 of the Report the term "Central School" was used to indicate a body of teachers and scholars, drawn from various Colleges. We do not see our way to constituting a University Professoriate, and we apprehend that Colleges will be unwilling to send their students on to a place of advanced study if they are to become students of another College. Thus, the head of Bareilly College might not wish to part with his best men to the Muir College, but he would send them as Bareilly Scholars to a School of Science at Allahabad, officered by Professors of the Muir College, but organized under the direct supervision of the

University. It may be admitted that the idea is still to some extent "shadowy." But the evidence shows that practical men are convinced that such Schools can be and ought to be constituted. If such Schools can be established, they will be of great value—(1) as giving the University a definite teaching function, and (2) as making more or less adequate provision for advanced study, which at present is neglected. By way of concrete illustration we may refer to the "School of Scientific Medicine" at Oxford. The name is not statutory, but it is commonly used to denote the body of Professors, Demonstrators and advanced students who carry on the work of research at the Museum. Mr. Justice Knox, Vice-Chancellor of the Allahabad University, worked out the notion of a Central School in some detail, and from him the Commission adopted the suggestion that the provision of residential quarters for the students from a distance ought to be regarded as an essential part of the scheme. We conceive that in an advanced School it should be possible to provide the necessary facilities for (1) young graduates who desire to obtain a thorough mastery of some branch of science, and (2) men at a later stage who have done some practical work and have returned to the University to qualify as specialists. Both classes are represented among the students of the Oxford School of Medicine. The question of funds is part of the general financial question which arises on the recommendations of the Commission.

We think power should be taken to appoint University Professors and Lecturers, but the creation of a Professoriate is beyond the resources of the Universities, and we have not dwelt on this point in the Report.

3. As to the reconstitution of the Senates, the plan of the Commission is beset by very serious difficulties; but the difficulties are, we submit, inherent in the nature of the subject. The

Simla Conference agreed that the number of Fellows must be reduced, and His Excellency agrees with the Commission in thinking that it must be reduced now, we are not to trust to the lapse of time. These conditions being accepted, it is inevitable that a considerable proportion of existing Fellows must be deprived of their rights. The members of the new Senates must be selected for the most part from among existing Fellows, and the task of selection will be so invidious that some of the Chancellors may be unwilling to undertake it.

As to the mode of selection, we have only two courses open to us—

(a) To name the new Fellows in the Act or Acts which we may find it expedient to pass. The objection to this is, that our selection would be discussed in open Council. The Legislative Council of today is a very different body from the Legislative Council of 1857. If any prominent member of what His Excellency calls the native party were left out of our lists, we should probably be charged with desiring to obtain a subservient Senate.

(b) The only other course is that proposed by the Commission, namely, to give the power of selection to the Chancellor.

4. As to the number of the proposed new Senate, the figures of the Commission are lower than those of the Conference. The Madras

and Bombay members of the Commission both laid stress on the difficulty of finding a large number of persons qualified to be working Fellows of the University. The evidence does not indicate that a Senate of 100 for the older Universities would be more unpopular than one of 120 to 150. Of those witnesses who agreed that the existing Senates are unwieldy, and that something more than the lapse of time method is needed for their reform, as many advocated numbers not exceeding as exceeding 100; and the advocates of the small Senates included important natives. Thus, in Calcutta whilst Surendra Nath Banerjee said that 100 or 150 would be a good number and suggested a plan that would reduce the number to 150 and Mr. Mahendra Nath Roy (late Professor, City College) had thought of some number between 100 and 200; Mr. P. K. Ray (Professor, Presidency College) would not have more than 50 and Mr. Krishna Kamal Bhattacharya (Principal of the Ripon College) thought that 100 would be quite sufficient. Again, in Madras on the one side are Mr. William Pillai (Inspector of Schools) who advocated a maximum of 150, and Mr. Srinivas Raghavai Aiyangar (Inspector General of Registration) who thought that if we were starting afresh 100 to 120 would be suitable; and on the other side Mr. G. Subramania Aiyar (Editor, "Madras Standard") who favours 70 to 75, Sir Bhashyam Aiyangar who would limit to 50, and Mr. Hanumanta Rao (Professor, College of Engineering) who gives a total of 85. Dr. Miller wants 120 and Mr. Stuart 30 to 40. In Bombay where the existing Senate is larger the numbers run higher. Mr. Justice Candy 130, Sir Balchandra Krishna 150, and Mr. Sanjana (Vice-Principal, Bhavnagar College) 200. Mr. Daruwala (Gujrat College) and Mr. Naegamvala, on the other hand, thought 100 sufficient and Mr. Giles, while saying that the total should not exceed 120, would prefer to reduce to 100 rather than raise to 150. Mr. Muller of the Elphinstone College wanted 200, Mr. Sharp of the same College 100 and the Reverend Father Dreckman of St. Xavier's College 100.

5. The rule that Fellowships are to be tenable for five years is proposed by the Commission as the permanent law of the University. On the

Paragraph 14 of His Excellency's note.

first nomination of Fellows, it is proposed that

power should be taken to nominate $\frac{1}{5}$ th of the whole for one year, $\frac{1}{5}$ th for two years, and so on. If it be provided that vacancies caused by death or resignation are filled up for the remainder of the term of the person vacating, we secure that $\frac{1}{5}$ th of the places (including places filled by election) in the Senate will have to be filled up every year. A similar principle of rotation has frequently been applied in England when new Boards are constituted, and it works without any difficulty. For this reason we hesitate to accept His Excellency's ruling that "such a procedure is obviously out of the question." Elected Fellows, like appointed Fellows, would be selected by the Chancellor, and would go out in rotation, so as to give an opportunity for two elections per annum.

The Commission was less favourable than the Conference to the election of Fellows. Syed Hossain Bilgrami would have done away with election altogether, and other Commissioners were of opinion that election introduces an undesirable element into the Senate. In deference to these opinions the number to be elected was limited to $\frac{1}{5}$ th of the whole. This would be an increase in the proportion of elected Fellows in Madras and Bombay where the figures stood last winter as follows:—Madras 189 Fellows, of whom 18 elected; Bombay 293 Fellows, of whom 17 elected. In the Calcutta University there were 181 Fellows (excluding the Vice-Chancellor and *ex-officio* Fellows), of whom 21 were elected. The total number had, however, been reduced from 205 in 1896. On the other hand, there have been 3 casualties among the 24 Fellows from time to time elected.

It must be admitted that the five years' tenure imposes a continuous task of some difficulty on the Chancellors. A Fellow who is not re-appointed at the end of his five years is tolerably certain to resent his exclusion; but this is a disadvantage incident to all deliberative bodies whose membership is renewed from time to time from the House of Commons downward.

The Commission found election by graduates an established institution in the older Universities, while election by the Senate is permitted by Statute at Allahabad and Lahore. It is proposed in the Report that these privileges should be retained; but, in case it should at any time be thought expedient that election by the Senate should be allowed in the older Universities, or election by graduates at Allahabad and Lahore, we suggest that the necessary legal power may be taken.

It is proposed in the Report to admit graduates of five years' standing to the electoral body. In Europe a man begins to take some part in the government of his University as soon as he has taken his Master's degree. Thus, at Oxford "a youth of perhaps only 24 or 25 years of age" acquires the right to vote on momentous questions affecting the University. The registration rule which we propose will have a tendency to restrict the number of graduates, and in so far as elections are made in Faculties, the electorate, except in the Arts Faculty, will not be numbered by thousands. The rules of election may, we think, be so framed as to guard against the danger apprehended by His Excellency.

Taking figures from the University Calendars the number of graduates in Arts up to and including the year 1896 is approximately—

Calcutta	7,660
Madras	4,356
Bombay	2,069
Allahabad	1,324
Punjab	670

These figures are too large, because there is no means of removing the names of persons who have died from the list. In making the calculations it is assumed that a candidate takes his M. A. degree two years after passing. This is not necessarily the case and a further, though much smaller, error is thus introduced.

6. The Report suggests that the new Fellows should be appointed on the understanding that they attend meetings of the Senate. There was some difference of opinion as to the expediency of a rule prescribing "what and how many meetings," and attaching a penalty to non-attendance. The Fellows are, or ought to be, persons of some distinction. They receive no emolument, and cannot therefore be fined for non-attendance, as the Fellows of an Oxford College are. The only possible penalty is deprivation, and it would be unreasonable to deprive a Calcutta Fellow, because he is officiating for a year as Director of Public Instruction in the United Provinces. In view of these difficulties the "understanding" recommended by the Commission may perhaps be more effective than a rule.

A Fellow holding office for five years is aware that if he neglects the business of the Senate, the Chancellor will have a valid reason for declining to re-appoint him.

7. The power to remove the name of a Fellow from the list may, we submit, be given in general terms: the Chancellor must ascertain and decide when a Fellow has ceased to be able to take part in University business. If a Fellow receives a *pucca* appointment in a distant Province, this is a reason for removing him from the active list; if the appointment is officiating, otherwise.

8. The Commission rejected, or rather postponed, the proposal to establish a Convocation of graduates ; and, if there is no Convocation, election must be, as at present, by means of voting papers. It is quite understood that the names of persons elected by graduates are submitted to the Chancellor, who is free to accept or reject them. It is desirable to have an express rule in

Paragraph 18 of His Excellency's note.

regard to improper canvassing, in order that all may know that certain practices, now common, are forbidden. The evidence taken by the Commission shows that there are Fellows now holding office who might have been rejected if such a rule has been in force.

Paragraph 21 of His Excellency's note.

9. The reference to " professional gentlemen of high standing " was meant to include not only lawyers, but all the professions.

10. On the question of text-books it may be remarked that the power of Government to prescribe and remove books will be defined by the proposed new Regulations. It is desirable that

Paragraph 26 of His Excellency's note.

such a power should be held in reserve ; but if Boards of Studies are properly constituted, the power will very seldom be exercised, and for this reason the President thought it unnecessary to press for a definite statement in the Report. When the orders already issued in regard to the institution of a School Final Examination are carried into effect, the University will cease to prescribe the text-books used in the higher classes of Schools.

11. The Commission recommend that the position and general powers of the Syndicate should be defined by Statute ; but it seems better to leave

Paragraph 27 of His Excellency's note.

the mode of election, etc., to be determined by Regulations to be framed as proposed in paragraph

195 of the Report. The number suggested (9 to 15) was unanimously approved by the Commission. There was some difference of opinion as to the expediency of giving teachers as such a majority on the Syndicate. Dr. Mackiehan is strongly of opinion that the power of supervision which it is proposed to give to the Syndicate cannot safely be exercised unless by a body on which College teachers are strongly represented. Paragraph 51 of the Report was drafted in this sense and was accepted by the Commission, the President, Dr. Banerjee and Mr. Hewett dissenting.

12. It is, we submit, undesirable that appointments made by the Syndicate should be discussed in the Senate. The Commission think that

Paragraph 28 of His Excellency's note.

questions relating to affiliation and disaffiliation of Colleges should be dealt with judicially ; full information

should be called for, both sides, where there are two sides, should have an opportunity of stating their views, and the reasons for the decision should be recorded in writing. The appeal to Government provides a remedy for any possible injustice on the part of the Syndicate. Dr. Banerjee would give the Senate an opportunity to express an opinion on any proposal to disaffiliate ; but the case of the Ripon College seems to show that public debate is not desirable. In that case the Senate rejected the proposal to disaffiliate, which was recommended by the Syndicate and approved by the Government of India.

13. As indicated in the Report, the University Libraries are at present of little use to

Paragraph 31 of His Excellency's note.

graduates or students. If Central Schools, as above defined, are established, the University

itself may desire to provide libraries in connexion with them. At Bombay, for example, the proposal for a Central School of Physics and Chemistry has been strongly supported. If such a School should be created, a single library, provided by the University, would dispense the Colleges from the necessity of incurring expense in completing their collections of scientific works. There ought, in like manner, to be a good Law Library in connexion with every Central School of Law. In answer to His Excellency's inquiry we may say that the Calcutta University Library is kept at the Senate House. Under the present rules it is open only to Fellows, and to persons having special permission to use it for purposes of literary research. It appears to us that the formation of University Libraries, such as are contemplated in the Report, would not discourage, but would rather promote, the improvement of College Libraries.

Paragraph 34 of His Excellency's note.

14. In regard to disaffiliation of Colleges, we think it necessary to distinguish between—

(a) Disaffiliations which may be rendered necessary by the transition from the old system to the new. The Report recommends disaffiliation of second-grade Colleges generally, and it is possible that a number of first-grade Colleges may continue to be affiliated in Arts, though they are disaffiliated in Science or in Law.

(b) Disaffiliation as the penal sanction of the new Regulations when they come into force. The sanction is undoubtedly necessary, but we trust that the Commission are not too sanguine when they anticipate that the penalty will rarely be inflicted. If the Syndicate's power of inspection is wisely exercised, the threat or prospect of disaffiliation should be enough to bring a College up to the mark.

15. As indicated in the Report, the Commission think that the Syndicate should go through the list of Colleges from time to time and remove the names of those which are hopelessly inefficient. The Commission considered a

proposal that affiliation should be for five years, or for some shorter term. But it was felt that a periodical revision of the list, as directed by an express Regulation, might soon degenerate into a formality. It was thought better to state clearly the duty incumbent on the Syndicate, and to leave the details of the system of inspection and control to be worked out in practice. When the Syndicate has to form an opinion as to the efficiency of a College, all the tests proposed in the Report will have to be taken into consideration.

16. In regard to recognition of Schools, even Dr. Banerjee admits that the Universities have no adequate means of obtaining the information necessary to a right decision. In Bengal the

Education Department is constantly dealing with new Schools which are started to compete with existing institutions. When the promoters of a new School can come direct to the Syndicate and obtain recognition the Department may suffer a local defeat, to the prejudice of sound teaching and discipline. The weakness of Dr. Banerjee's argument on this point seems to show that the view taken by the Commission is sound.

17. We think that Latin must hold its ground, of course as an optional subject, in Indian Universities. For some Europeans and

Paragraph 42 of His Excellency's note. Eurasians, and for Natives of India who are proceeding to English Universities, it may be considered a necessary subject. We understand that Latin is really well taught in some Colleges, and especially in those under Jesuit management.

18. The Commission recommended that modern European languages should not be included in the B.A. courses, but conceded that

Paragraph 45 of His Excellency's note. female candidates should be allowed to offer French.

19. As His Excellency is aware, the place of History in University courses has been much discussed. The Commission adhere to the

Paragraph 46 of His Excellency's note. opinion that the chief object of a course of University study should be, not the acquisition of useful knowledge, but a thorough mental training. High authorities at Oxford have maintained that if you wish to make a man a student of History, you should direct him to the School of *Literæ Humaniores*, so that he may be thoroughly trained in scholarship and Logic. He will then be able to read History for himself. The School of Modern History can teach the student a certain number of facts; but the Political Economy subject represents all the dialectic training received by candidates in that School. The majority of the Commissioners are in sympathy with this view of the matter; they have therefore proposed the retention of Mathematics, and of Logic supplemented by the elements of Psychology, in the programme of the Indian Universities. History they relegate to the position of an optional subject, and they combine it with Political Economy. It is

Paragraph 48 of His Excellency's note. admitted in the Report that the present methods of teaching Political Economy may be improved.

20. There are no "Law Colleges" at Dacca, Barisal, etc., only Law Classes

Paragraph 51 of His Excellency's note. or Law Departments in connexion with Arts Colleges. The Commission think that these Classes and Departments should disappear, unless it can be shown that they are capable of becoming centres of *bond file* legal teaching. To explain the meaning of this phrase, we may refer to the case of Aligarh mentioned in paragraph 118 of the Report. The Commission anticipate that when Law Classes are kept up merely for the sake of profit, they will be abandoned. Under the new system it will cost too much to make them efficient.

21. The examination in commercial subjects conducted by the Punjab University is

Paragraph 55 of His Excellency's note. really a School examination, and for this reason it

is not mentioned in paragraph 119 of the Report.

22. As to the training of teachers, it may perhaps be enough to say that the Commission

Paragraph 56 of His Excellency's note. reported, not on the general question of providing more Training Colleges, but on the somewhat narrower question, what the Universities can do to promote the better training of teachers in Schools.

23. All the Commissioners, except Dr. Banerjee, would have preferred to fix 16 rather

Paragraph 59 of His Excellency's note. than 15 as the age-limit for the Entrance Examination. But it was thought that the practical

difficulties would be less if 15 were prescribed; and by accepting 15 as the limit the

Commission places itself in line with the Committee of the Calcutta Senate which reported not long ago on the Arts Courses of that University.

24. The Punjab rules for "private students" are laxer than those of any other University; but the percentage of "private" candidates for Matriculation is largest at Bombay, while the percentage for Madras is nearly the same as for the Punjab. We think it right that, so far as the Entrance Examination is concerned, some provision should be made for the case of private students. But, after Entrance, students should, as far as possible, receive their training in the Colleges of the University. Exemptions from the rule should be very rare, and the Commission desire to place an obstacle in the way by requiring the consent of the Senate. The "exemptions from examination rules" referred to at the end of paragraph 51 of the Report are of a less important character.

25. The Honours Courses which have been introduced at Calcutta were not defended either by Dr. Banerjee or by Mr. Pedler, and the opinion of the Commission was that our Colleges have not at present the staff and resources to make adequate arrangements for both Honours men and Pass men. It was feared that the best teachers in a College would concentrate their efforts on the Honours men, and that the general standard might be lowered in consequence. The advocates of Honours Courses are found, for the most part, among those who also advocate early specialisation, and we consider that an Indian student is not fit to take up a special subject until he has finished his B. A. Course.

26. The reason for proposing to allow teachers to examine was that by excluding them we exclude the persons most competent to examine fairly. It may be admitted that the combination of functions will always give occasion for charges of unfairness, but the Commission have endeavoured to provide against this by advising that Boards of Examiners should set and mark papers in consultation.

27. The Commission desire to discourage, as far as possible, the present custom of publishing the marks of candidates; and they proposed that a candidate seeking to know his marks should pay a fee. The point is not one to which we attach great importance.

28. The Commission intended to apply the rule that a candidate may not appear more than three times to the Entrance Examination only.

29. In reference to Simla Resolution 2 (Co-operation between Colleges) we may say that while nobody has any objection to the principle, no practical suggestion was before the Commission. In some towns, Poona for example, the distances between Colleges are so great that inter-collegiate lectures are out of the question; and in the important Colleges the ordinary Arts and Science Classes are already large enough, and in many cases too large.

30. In reference to Simla Resolution 33 (Interchange of Examiners) we made inquiry and found that in all Universities outside Examiners are occasionally employed. At Allahabad it is the regular practice to appoint outside Examiners, but the opinions given as to the advantages and disadvantages of such appointments left us in some doubt as to this matter: and the Commission did not see their way to make any recommendation. At Madras Mr. Chatterton spoke strongly in favour of having one set of Examiners for students of Engineering, but the Principal of the Local Engineering College thought the scheme was not necessary and doubted whether the results would be good. We found that the authorities of the Medical Colleges were, generally speaking, opposed to the establishment of one medical qualification for India.

31. In reference to Simla Resolution 35 (Combined Lectures), we may say that our suggestions in regard to Central Schools were intended to show how practical effect may be given to the policy of the Conference.

When such Schools have not been constituted, it is generally agreed that Colleges might combine, either of their own accord or at the invitation of the University, in providing combined lectures for those of their students who are going on to the M. A. degree.

32. In reference to Simla Resolution 39 (Utilisation of Endowments), we found that the funds now held by the Universities are held on trusts; that no scheme of amalgamation could be carried out unless by Legislative authority; and that any such scheme would be resented by the donors or their representatives, who desire that the name of the donor should be perpetuated, and that his wishes should in all cases be strictly observed. At Oxford and Cambridge objections of this kind have been overcome by the power of Parliament; in India it is doubtful whether the amount of money to be obtained would repay the trouble of bringing the Legislative machine into action.

T. RALEIGH,—28-7-02.

J. P. HEWETT,—28-7-02.

Private Secretary to Governor General.

J. P. HEWETT,—28-7-02.

I am much obliged for the answers and explanations. There are several of them upon which I might comment. But I will not delay the file by further noting at the present stage. Perhaps Mr. Ibbetson would now be good enough to record any observations that he may care to make : and if he will then pass the file into general circulation, we can take the case, after it has been seen and noted upon by all Honourable Members, on my return to Simla.

C[URZON],—28-7-02.

The Honourable Mr. Ibbetson.

J. P. HEWETT,—29-7-02.

Taking His Excellency's note as a text, I note below the remarks which I have to make upon this case. Where I differ from the conclusions of the Commission, I do so with diffidence ; for my knowledge of the working of Indian Universities is confined to the Punjab, and is 20 years old ; whereas they have recently examined into the actual conditions which prevail in each Province.

2. I incline to the smaller number of Fellows suggested by the Commission, not to the larger proportion of elected Fellows (one-fifth) suggested by the Conference. The great objection to the present system, under which a certain number of Fellows are periodically elected, arises from the fact that Native Fellows are practically elected for life, while European Fellows leave the country. Thus the former constantly accumulate and tend to largely exceed the latter. If the Senate is to be reconstituted every five years, and the elected Fellows limited to a constant proportion of the whole, this difficulty disappears, and we can afford to be reasonably liberal in the matter of election. I think that non-attendance at meetings for a year might render a Fellow liable to have his name removed.

3. As for the initial reconstitution of the Senate, I think that those of the elected Fellows who are to be retained might be chosen by ballot. I would then appoint the new members of the Senate in the first instance for three years, after which one-fifth of the nominated and elected Fellows respectively would retire each year, the individuals for retirement being selected by ballot. Thus no Fellow would serve less than three years, and by the end of eight years we should have the normal constitution of the Senate, with its annual renewal of one-fifth of each class, fully established. The annual appointments to vacancies by death, retirement, and so forth, would afford an opportunity of to some extent redressing the inequalities in the constitution of the Senate which the chances of the ballot might produce. In any case they would be temporary only.

4. For the electoral body I incline to the Bombay rule, as given in Mr. Hewett's marginal note to paragraph 17 of His Excellency's note. I think the proposed annual fee for registration will largely reduce the franchise. Many B. As. will not pay an annual fee, however small, for ten years, in order to obtain a vote at the end of that time. I fear that we must either allow voting papers, or practically put the elections into the hands of residents in the capital towns, which is undesirable.

5. I would put Mathematics under the Science, not the Arts Faculty (paragraph 36 of the Report).

6. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Banerjee that cases of penal disaffiliation should be referred to the Senate. With our reformed Senates, it may be hoped that such cases as that of the Ripon College will not occur. But I think that any initial disaffiliations consequent upon the introduction of the new system [paragraph 14 (a) of the supplementary note by Messrs. Raleigh and Hewett] should be dealt with by a strong Committee of the reformed Senate appointed by the Chancellor *ad hoc*. We should never get them through the whole Senate.

7. As regards penal disaffiliation, I think the rule should be that it should follow upon any defect which would prevent the affiliation of the College if it were being applied for in the first instance, after due warning and failure to remedy the defect within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Syndicate.

7-A. I agree with the Commission that probationary affiliation would be a mistake. The tendency would be to give it too easily, in the hope of improvement that would never be exacted.

8. The minimum fee question is one of the points upon which the recommendations of the Commission will be most fiercely attacked. I confess that I think the manner in which they have presented it is unfortunate, in that they have placed in the forefront of the battle the argument that low fees tempt poor students to follow a University course of which they are not fitted to take advantage. The argument is not wholly without weight ; but I think it is fairly open to most of Mr. Banerjee's criticisms, and that it would have been wise to keep it in a subordinate place. To my mind the main argument in favour of a minimum scale of fees is that set forth in paragraph 73 of the Report. In the case of Government and aided schools, the avowed policy of Government is gradually to raise the fee until the student pays a reasonable proportion of the cost of an education which has a high commercial value, due provision being made by means of scholarships for the case of poor but clever students. The minimum scale of fees is fixed somewhat lower in aided than in Government

institutions, so as to prevent the latter from competing unfairly with the former. Now it will not be contended that our aided Colleges (a very substantial proportion of the expenditure on which is borne by Government) have reached any extravagant standard of efficiency. And it follows that, without a Government grant, and with a lower scale of fees, the efficiency must be still lower. It is all very well to argue, as Mr. Banerjee does, that efficiency can be insisted upon under penalty of disaffiliation. But efficiency is difficult to measure, its estimation is open to dispute, and a rule that, with a fee-scale below a certain limit, efficiency in an unaided College is impossible, and may therefore be presumed, clears the ground most usefully. I should be inclined to take this line in adopting (subject to the opinions of Local Governments) the recommendation of the Commission.

9. The recommendation for the abolition of second-grade Colleges as such (paragraph 77 of the Report) is almost the only recommendation of importance made by the Commission with which I find myself unable to agree. The student enters upon his college course at a younger age in India than in England; there is not the same strong public opinion among his fellows to help to keep him straight; in the absence of proper hostels (to the provision of which I attach the greatest importance), no complete supervision is provided; he has not the grit of the Scotch youth to keep him straight; and I think the anxiety of the parents to postpone the day of his departure for a large town at a distance is reasonable. The F. A. is recognized as a distinct educational stage, and a lad who will not in any case proceed to the B. A. is the better for the two years' study between the Entrance and the F. A. But education at a distance is more expensive than education close to the home. I admit the expediency of separating the College from the school life as far as may be; but there are other considerations which I think possess more weight. I entirely agree that the same standard of efficiency should be insisted upon in second-grade as in first-grade Colleges up to the point to which they teach respectively. Such of the former as are frauds and inefficient should be abolished. But by forcing an efficient second-grade College to raise itself to the first-grade, we run great risk of destroying its efficiency. I think a good second-grade College fulfils a useful function, while an inferior first-grade College does not.

10. As regards the recognition of private schools (paragraph 78 of the Report), the practical difference between the recommendation of the Commission and that of Mr. Banerjee is trifling: while as to the manner in which the point should be put, and its effect upon public opinion, I incline rather towards Mr. Banerjee's view. I think it would be a mistake to lay down that the recognition of a private school depends upon its compliance "with the departmental rules for the time being in force." We may recognize that the Education Department must advise the Syndicate in the matter; but the points upon which they should be asked to advise are, as stated by Mr. Banerjee, whether the school is well-conducted, its teaching efficient, and its discipline good; not whether it conforms with departmental rules and standards.

11. I most heartily agree in the views expressed in paragraph 83 of the Report about the teaching of English. One of the weakest points of our educational system is the readiness with which we have lent ourselves to the substitution of bad English for good vernacular schools; and one of my chief objects when Director of Public Instruction in the Punjab was to stiffen the back of the Department in the matter. No aid from public funds should be given to a school at which English is taught, but not taught with reasonable efficiency. To enforce this rule at once would, I imagine, mean the closing or transformation of half the secondary Anglo-vernacular schools in the country. This is impossible, though they should never have been allowed to come into existence, at any rate as aided schools. But it should be our constant aim, both in the Educational Department and in the Universities, either to improve them or to abolish them.

12. The difficulty about Latin might perhaps be met by the application of the very wholesome recommendation that the affiliation of each College should be in respect of specified subjects, as well as up to a specified standard. Latin would then be confined to institutions where it is taught efficiently.

13. The Punjab Government will of course be consulted upon the suggestions of paragraphs 97-99 regarding the Oriental side of the Punjab University. I think that in consulting them we must recognize that it may be necessary to accept certain shortcomings, rather than expose ourselves to an imputation of breach of faith with the Chiefs to whose liberality the University largely owes its existence.

14. I most cordially agree with His Excellency's objection to Philosophy and preference for History. It is true that Psychology and Ethics and Metaphysics have "a high disciplinary value in the training of the mind"; and it is a discipline which is of especial value to the hard-headed practical-minded Englishman. But it is a discipline which is least of all required by, and which in my opinion is positively harmful to, the Oriental. His whole mental trend is towards subtlety, towards substituting dreams for acts, towards playing with words as if they were things, and being content to do so. I should like to see some Logic, both deductive and inductive, included in the course; for the native is often sorely wanting in it. But the less Metaphysics and the like, the better to my mind. Similar considerations lead me to agree with His Excellency in preferring Geography (properly taught) to Political Economy.

15. On similar grounds I regret deeply that I am compelled to agree with the Commission that Science should form no compulsory part of the Entrance test. But I would leave it an optional subject. And I confess that I should like to see it made compulsory in the Intermediate course. Its importance to the native is enormous. It affords to him the only connection with the practical facts that surround him, the only means of compelling him into contact with them. Moreover, the one great need of the country is the application of native capital under native supervision to its industrial development. I do not mean to suggest that the amount of Science included in the F. A. course will fit a lad for such employment. But it will turn his thoughts to practical matters; it will give him a chance of discovering his scientific bent, if he has one; and, above all, it will show him that the scientific application of labour is not a mere manual matter unworthy of the attention of a scholar and a University man, but that it demands intellectual power and training as much as does teaching in a school or arguing in a Court of Law. I know how grievous are the shortcomings of the teaching of Science in our schools. But to exclude the subject altogether will be to take away all hope of improvement. I hope that some day we may be able to add Mechanics to our list of Sciences.

16. On the other hand, I would not make Mathematics compulsory. Some men of great ability are incapable of mathematical thought, as others have no ear for music.

17. I would deal with Law classes on the same lines as second grade Arts Colleges (paragraph 9 of this note). Efficiency should be strictly insisted on up to the point to which they teach; and that being secured, I would accept their teaching up to that point as part of the course which the candidates must undergo. I do not see why the candidate should not obtain a portion or the whole of his training at Karachi, instead of being compelled to go to Bombay for it, if only the teaching at Karachi is sufficiently good, even though it may not be quite as good as that obtainable at Bombay. The enforcement of reasonable efficiency would doubtless lead to the closing of many of the existing Law classes—a result by no means to be regretted. But such of them as can and will make themselves efficient should, I think, be encouraged, as fulfilling a useful function. I think that, as in the case of Arts, a Central Law College, with fees pitched at a rate commensurate with the commercial value of the education, should be established at each University centre, and, if necessary, by Government. But as His Excellency remarks, it should be a model merely; I would not give it a monopoly.

18. I think we shall be justified in treating Medicine upon far stricter lines than Law. Half-baked lawyers do harm enough; but a number of half-baked doctors let loose upon the country with the University stamp upon them would do far greater harm. Moreover, the people accept our Law only too readily; while our Surgery and Medicine still have to make their way. I think that Government should retain a very strict control over the courses and standards in Medicine, special regulations being made for the Faculty and Board of Studies. And I agree with the Commission that the teaching for University degrees is rightly centralised, for the present, in Government Colleges. I do not know what functions the private Medical Colleges mentioned in paragraph 136 of the Report fulfil. But I do not think that, for years to come, any such Colleges should be recognized or affiliated by the University.

19. I would go even further than His Excellency, and say that provision for instruction in Mining-Engineering and management is a present and pressing need. Under our Mines Act we have power to prescribe certain qualifications for the Managers of Mines, and common justice to the small native-owners demands that we should provide the necessary training. The question is already under separate consideration.

20. I agree with His Excellency in preferring 16 to 15 as the lowest age for Matriculation. As for the falsification of age, a great deal of it is due to the culpable weakness of Local Governments, which allow a man who has declared his age and thereby obtained admission to some examination or office, to revise his declaration 30 years later, when the question of retirement arises, on the strength of a horoscope conveniently found in a back cupboard. If it were an absolute rule that any declaration of age for public purposes, express or implied, would be enforced against a man throughout his service, we should have much less of falsification.

21. I would leave the admission of private students to the Syndicate. To remove it to the Senate seems somewhat inconsistent with the proposal not to allow the Senate to review disaffiliations by the Syndicate. Is in the one case the Senate, and in the other the Syndicate the only body to be trusted?

22. I regard the institution of the School Final Examination as one of the most important reforms now under consideration. It will remove our schools from the control of the Universities, which has been by no means uniformly beneficial. And it will enable us to take an additional step (as I shall presently suggest) in the discouragement of examination for examination's sake. But if it is to have the desired effect, I think it will be absolutely necessary to substitute it for the Entrance as a condition of admission to any Government office or institution except an affiliated College, thus relegating the Entrance Examination to its proper function. And, since it will be conducted by the Education Department, and in order to meet the criticisms of Mr. Banerjee, I think it should be made clear that the examination will be of such a general nature that success in it will depend upon knowledge of

the subjects, and not upon that knowledge having been acquired by any particular course or in any particular manner.

23. How far the Universities will be able to accept it as a total or partial substitute for the Entrance will depend mainly upon details. If they do, we must admit to it boys from all schools recognized by the Universities, and also private students which they have accepted for Matriculation. To do so will make the Universities, and not ourselves, judges of one important element of fitness for Government service. At present, however, they are the judges of all, so far as education is concerned.

24. I do not know what fees are at present charged for the Entrance Examination; but I imagine they are low, as I believe that practically all the boys who have completed the High School course present themselves for examination. If it is desired to discourage this, Mr. Hewett tells me that it is Rs. 10 at Calcutta, Rs. 12 elsewhere, and Rs. 15 for private students at Allahabad.

DENZIL I[BBETSON].

it would be easy to do so by fixing a high fee for the Final School Examination. In so far as it takes the place of an Entrance Examination, the fees would not discourage those who can afford and intend to enter upon a University course. As regards all other students, they have had their schooling; an examination will not add to their knowledge; it will only certify to its extent; as doing so, it has a commercial value, and may be charged for accordingly.

25. As regards the Honours Course, would it not be sufficient to divide the B. A. into classes, the standard of marks demanded for inclusion in, say, the first and second being so high as to constitute a real distinction, while the third-class contained the ruck? Honours proper would then be reserved for the M. A. Examination.

26. As for examination by teachers, the proposal to define the sphere of influence of each University seems to offer an escape from the difficulty, the prohibition being confined to teachers within that sphere. The papers could still be set by men employed in teaching the subject, but without the sphere of influence of the University.

27. I think that, in publishing our views in this matter, we should emphatically disclaim any intention of departing from the policy laid down once for all by the Education Commission of 1882, that it is important to encourage private enterprise in the matter of education, both because to do so shifts a larger proportion of the cost on to the shoulders of those who should properly bear it, and because private enterprise is more likely than is any Government Department, to adapt itself to the varying needs and conditions of different places and different times. This policy was deliberately accepted at the time by the Government of India, and our adherence to it stands unshaken.

28. But the condition upon which private enterprise should be encouraged is, that the education which it offers is reasonably efficient; by which is meant, not that it follows any prescribed set of rules or courses of study, but that discipline is enforced, good morals inculcated, and adequate provision made for instruction. Inferior education at cheap rates is in all countries a snare to parents, and a danger to their children; and it is especially so in India, where occidental education dates from yesterday. It is the bounden duty of Government, with regard to schools, and of the Universities (which derive their authority from Government) in respect of colleges, to do all that lies in their power to discourage what is educationally pernicious, and at least to abstain from lending it their countenance.

29. Under the existing conditions of education in India, the standard of efficiency which it is proper and possible to enforce is admittedly not so high as that which is attained in more advanced countries. But it should be our constant endeavour to raise it, not so as to deprive the children of the country of the means of education, but to protect them, so far as may be, against wasting the only years of their lives during which education is possible. The most dangerous enemy to legitimate private enterprise in matters educational is the school or college which reduces expenditure to a point at which efficiency is impossible, and thus tempts parents to take their boys from soundly conducted institutions, and send them where the training they receive is as inferior as it is cheap. To discourage such institutions is the most practically effectual method of encouraging all such private enterprise as is deserving of encouragement; and it is to this end that many of the most important changes now proposed are directed.

DENZIL I[BBETSON],—7-8-02.

The gist of the recommendations of the Commission appears to be in the concluding clause of paragraph 197 of their Report "that it is better for India that a comparatively small number of young men should receive a sound liberal education than that a large number should be passed through an inadequate course of instruction, leading to a depreciated degree."

With this view I am entirely in sympathy. The present system turns out a large number of so-called educated youths; some no doubt are well educated, but the majority are possessed of a good deal of parrot-like knowledge which they are unable to put to practical use. They all aspire to Government employment for which many of them are totally unfitted.

I have no doubt that the proposals of the Commission after they have, by discussion, been brought into their final form will tend to remove existing evils and promote the main object they have in view. Not having had the advantage of a University education myself and my practical knowledge of Indian Universities being limited to one visit last winter to the University Hall at Calcutta, I do not attempt to criticise the details of the Report.

I am prepared to support the recommendations of those best qualified to advise as to the best means of attaining the objects in view.

In regard to Government aid, I am in favour of making the people who benefit by higher education pay for what has a high commercial value, but I fully recognize that the recommendation of the Committee will probably reduce the incomes of Universities and render State aid a necessity if we are to attain our object.

If I may add one point which particularly struck me at the Calcutta Convocation. It was that physically the men who came up for degrees were a very poor lot, and that combined with this there were few who showed in their faces any strength of character.

The majority looked weak and gave no indications of those qualities which would ensure them success in life and tend to make them valuable Government servants. This was the prevailing impression of my first touch with Indian University life.

E. R. E[LIES],—19-8-02.

Seen.

J. F. F[INLAY],—22-8-02.

Paragraphs 21—26.—Teaching Universities.

As the Universities of India are not all under the same conditions and need to be prepared for possible developments, it seems right and proper to give them power to establish Central Schools and to appoint Professors. But as far as the Madras University is concerned (I was a Fellow and a member of the Syndicate), I cannot imagine that such powers will be of any practical use. Developments in study or research will find place in the colleges already equipped for the purposes, and not in the Senate House,—the local habitation of the University—which consists of a hall and an office, though it may be admitted it has a theatre for lectures and concerts.

Paragraphs 29—32.—Proposals for New Universities.

I fully agree that there should at present be no addition to the Indian Universities. Burma will in time require one, but education is so backward in that province that the time is probably distant.

Paragraphs 33—35.—The Senate.

I am in favour of the recommendation of the Commission to reduce the number to 100 in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. There will in any case be an outcry from the native press at any reduction, and that outcry will not be appreciably different whether the reduction be to 100 or to 120—150. Efficiency is our object; we shall never again have such an opportunity of securing it, and I would not hesitate to adopt what the experts regard as the wisest course.

Paragraph 36.—Mathematics. See below paragraph 105.

Paragraph 37.—For the reasons given by Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson (paragraph 2 of his note I think that one-fifth of the Senate may safely be elected.

Paragraph 39.—The method suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson (paragraph 3 of his note) for appointing the new Senates seems to me the best way of meeting the difficulties about tenure of Fellowships and of securing the regular vacation of a fifth of all the Fellowships every year after the third.

Paragraph 40.—I prefer the Madras rule for the elector's qualification (Mr. Hewett's note to paragraph 17 of His Excellency's note). The elected Fellows in Madras have on the whole been a success. I am strongly of opinion that graduates of five years' standing are not of sufficient age, and do not possess sufficient experience, knowledge of men and stability of character to be fit to elect Fellows to the Senate. I would charge a fee for registration as an elector. In the London University it used to be £2 to become a member of Convocation. The qualification of the candidates for election to Fellowships may then be the same as the electors. As suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson, non-attendance for a year might render a Fellow liable to be removed.

Voting papers must be provided, I presume, for non-resident voters. If it is feasible to elect Fellows direct to the different Faculties, it will have to be provided that out of the total elected $\frac{1}{5}$ or $\frac{1}{6}$, as the case may be, so many will be for each Faculty. In that case the candidate for election must hold a degree of the Faculty where there is a vacancy. But I am not sure that the electors should be limited to those holding degrees of that Faculty. In some Universities the electoral body in the Faculties of, say, Medicine or Engineering would be very

small : it is conceivable that if the electoral qualification is high, there might be no electors. There would certainly be none if a new degree and a new Faculty were introduced. As the total number of elected Fellows will be small, this is not a fatal objection. The Chancellor should retain his power of refusing to accept or ratify an election. I don't know what improper canvassing means. If it means bribery, direct or indirect, it would of course be a valid reason for disallowing an election.

Paragraph 41.—I think Honorary Fellowships will serve a useful purpose.

Paragraph 43.—No voting by proxy should be allowed in the Senate. I think it would be better for the Senates to require a two-thirds majority for the repeal or alteration of a regulation or bye-law instead of throwing on Government the onus of rejecting a simple majority vote.

Paragraph 47.—A Theological Faculty with Theological Degrees would be an absurdity. Imagine concurrent examinations for the degree of D. D. in Christian, Hindu, Mahomedan, Buddhist and Jain theology, or in a mixture of all.

Paragraphs 48—49.—Boards of Studies. I agree with His Excellency that the power of Government to prescribe and proscribe text-books should be retained, but with the reformed Senate the existence of the power will probably be all that is needed, and it will seldom if ever be put into force.

Paragraph 51.—The Syndicate. I think it would be a mistake to be so rigid in the constitution of the Syndicate as is proposed ; to the numbers 9—15 I see no objection, though I prefer the smaller. I agree with Mr. Banerji's objections to clause (c) in paragraph 9 of his dissent. When I was on the Syndicate of the Madras University, out of a total of ten, four of us, *viz.*, the Vice-Chancellor, Sir Arthur Collins, Mr. Justice Sheppard, the Hon'ble Mr. Bashyam Iyengar and myself were not engaged in education at all. The educational men need stiffening sometimes from the outside. The Director of Public Instruction ought to be *ex-officio* a member of the Syndicate. I agree with His Excellency that new regulations should be framed as proposed for each University on this subject.

Paragraph 51 (d).—If Government possess the power to disaffiliate on the recommendation of the Syndicate with or without the concurrence of the Senate, there will be the less objection to allowing the Senate to discuss and express an opinion on each case. But see paragraph 57 below. Special provision may have to be made as suggested by the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson for disaffiliation consequent on the new rules. Probationary affiliation seems open to objection; a college ought to be thoroughly fit for affiliation before it is affiliated and then no probation would be needed. But there may be special reasons unknown to me which induce educational authorities to recommend temporary affiliation.

Paragraph 55.—Graduates. Graduates should be allowed to compound for life by a lump sum instead of making an annual payment for retention of name on the register. The other proposals seem sound.

Paragraph 57.—Affiliated Colleges, etc. It seems to me that the rules should provide that disaffiliation shall follow certain definite consequences after due warning. This will strengthen the hands of the University Syndicates and prevent the Senates from undue laxity. If no such rule is passed, it will be difficult to get any Senate to approve a proposal to disaffiliate, and the necessary action must be taken by Government with or without the recommendation of the Syndicate.

Paragraph 58.—I don't think that members of the Syndicate should visit Colleges within their jurisdiction for the purpose of ascertaining whether the rules of affiliation, etc., are observed. At the time I was on the Madras University Syndicate the four members named in paragraph 51 above and at least two other members did not possess the requisite knowledge of educational rules, etc., even if they could have spared the time. Then what if the Revd. Dr. Miller, then a member of the Syndicate, had paid a formal visit of inspection and criticism to the Jesuit College presided over by his rival, the Revd. F. Sewell? The Educational Department should, I think, conduct all such inspections. I can imagine nothing more likely to cause animosity and dissension than for the head or professor of a college dressed in the little and perhaps brief authority of a member of the Syndicate being required or even permitted to conduct an official inspection of another and possibly rival institution. The Syndicate, as a body, might perhaps be empowered to appoint a committee of not less than two persons outside their own body, one of whom should possess experience as a Government Inspector of Schools, to inspect and report on any institution affiliated or seeking affiliation.

Paragraph 65.—Discipline. I wish the Commission had said something on the want of signs of external respect from students to teachers and others. It is in marked contrast to the respect paid by the disciple to his *pundit* or *guru*. At the Calcutta Convocation I was struck, as I have been at Convocations in Madras, by the rude and boorish behaviour of many of the graduates in failing to salaam or to bow to the Vice-Chancellor or the Chancellor when receiving their diplomas, etc.

Paragraphs 71—75.—Fees.

I think a case has been made out for the levy of a minimum fee, not with any view to deter poor lads from becoming students, but to ensure the maintenance of the institution in a

high state of efficiency, and to relieve the State by slow degrees of part of the cost of higher education, transferring the burden to those who desire the higher education as a remunerative investment. The Madras system was sound enough in theory, but was useless, because the penalties for failure to levy the standard fee were never imposed. The Commission is loth to believe that school or college accounts would be falsified, but it is nevertheless the fact that this has been frequently done and I fear it will be done again. I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson that the argument in favour of minimum fees might have been more cogently presented. Who but the poor student and his friends is to determine whether "it is to his real interest to undertake" a University course?

Paragraph 76.—Transfer of Students. These are very valuable proposals.

Paragraph 77.—College and School. I should like to hear the views of Local Governments about the abolition of second-grade colleges. Ceylon may also be interested in the matter. That some of the second-grade colleges may well be got-rid of seems true enough, but there are others which, owing to inaccessibility or other good reason, may fill a useful purpose. It might be safe in most Presidencies to refuse to affiliate any more second grade colleges. But it is possible that Burma, as she develops, may have need for second grade colleges. And what about Ceylon?

Paragraph 78.—Recognition of Schools. I fully agree with the Commission on this point, differing thereon from the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson. It is, I think, impracticable for the Syndicate to obtain any information worthy of the name regarding a school except from the inspection reports of the Educational Department, and unless that department can certify that a school conforms to what is recognized by rules accepted by the Syndicate as necessary, the school should not, in my opinion, be recognized.

Paragraphs 83—86.—English.

I agree generally with what is said and recommended. The first part of the last sentence of paragraph 83, however, is puzzling: " * * * it is desirable that the study of English should not be permitted to be begun till a boy can be expected to understand what he is being taught in that language * * * ". Surely a child old enough to go to school and learn reading at all can understand—"This is a cow, that is a dog." English boys begin Latin at a very early age and learn that "Balbus was building a wall." I cordially agree that native teachers should be taught "expression and elocution," and I would add "pronunciation" at a training college. Many, perhaps most, of our graduates, at any rate in Madras, have a most objectionable habit of spasmodically gabbling their sentences in fragments: the only parallel I know among the English-born is the way some clergymen rush the exhortation—"Dearly beloved brethren—the scripture moveth us in sundry places," etc. I think that the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson's proposal in paragraph 12 of his note meets the case of Latin.

Paragraph 94.—Vernacular languages. I agree that the study of these should be maintained. I have often met graduates with but a poor knowledge of their own language and unable to read the current written hand.

Paragraph 100.—Modern languages of Europe.

French is ordinarily taken in Madras, I believe, by those who have learned to speak and write it in Pondicherry.

Paragraphs 101—109.—Philosophy, History, Science. I cordially agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson in paragraph 14 of his note as to the relative mental needs of the "practical hard-headed Englishman" and the subtle, dreamy Oriental, and on one occasion I horrified with similar doctrine the Revd. Dr. Miller who keeps all his Scotch battery of lectures on metaphysics ready to be discharged by a suitable professor. But it would be a strong measure to cut out of the B. A. curriculum the study of metaphysical philosophy for which India has been so famous. It will be interesting to see what Local Governments have to say.

I greatly doubt whether the study of history will have the beneficial effects anticipated by His Excellency. The practical deduction of "young India" from a study of English History is to agitate for the reform of the British Government in India by the introduction of similar representative institutions. A course of practical science as advocated by the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson would, I think, for the ordinary graduate be worth all the metaphysics and all the history put together.

Paragraph 105.—Mathematics. The question of mathematics for the F. A. is difficult. On the one hand, it would inevitably bar from a degree any budding Dean Stanley's there might be: on the other, it must be remembered that the ranks of the Public Service are recruited by the ordinary B. A., and that a knowledge of mathematics is often of considerable value. I should be disposed to leave the matter to the Universities who will probably not make any compulsory test too severe.

Paragraph 106.—History, Political Economy and Geography. I am afraid I share His Excellency's heterodox views as to what Carlyle called "the dismal science" of political economy, at any rate as I was taught it. Mill and Fawcett committed what I humbly think to be the enormous blunder of teaching that Capital and Labour flow in the direction

they may be wanted like water under pressure, without dwelling on the misery to a whole generation of workers whose industry is superseded and who are unable to learn a new trade. The late Mr. Fawcett once admitted to me that there might be truth in this. But the text books may now be improved, and if the science were taught as proposed in the last sentence of paragraph 107, the result might be excellent.

Paragraph 109.—Science Courses. I agree with all that is said as to requiring science teaching to be practical.

Paragraph 118.—Law. The proposals for securing efficiency in law classes seem well worthy of support.

Paragraph 123.—140.—Medicine. I agree with the Commission throughout.

Paragraph 145.—Engineering. I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson (paragraph 19 of his note) as to the need for instruction in mining engineering.

Paragraph 163.—Age-limit. I think 16 should be the minimum age for the matriculation and agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson's remarks in paragraph 20 of his note about falsification.

Paragraph 166.—Private students. I cannot agree that it should be any part of the duty of an Inspector of Schools to put a private student through a test examination to see if he is fit to go in for the matriculation. Indeed I cannot understand how the Director of Public Instruction could ever have sanctioned such an interference with the legitimate duties of a Government Inspector. Why should not the private student produce a certificate from a recognized head master that the latter has satisfactorily tested him. The student would no doubt have to pay a fee for this. The Syndicate seems the proper authority to pass orders on the application.

Paragraph 169.—Matriculation and Government Service. I do not think the proposal to substitute a school final examination for the matriculation as a qualification for Government service is sound. The swarm of candidates that now flock to the matriculation will flock to the school final instead, and the objections stated in paragraph 160 to the matriculation will equally apply to the school final, and will be still greater if the school final is easier than the matriculation.

A general objection to the school final as qualifying for Government Service is that it will be instituted and held by Government, and every individual who passes will consider he has thereby some sort of claim on Government for an appointment. A large contingent of discontented aspirants to office with a grievance against Government will thereby be created. This cannot be the case so long as Government merely recognizes an examination held by the University for a totally different purpose to be incidentally a qualification for admission to its own service. The true solution seems to me to lie in raising the Standard of the Matriculation. The Universities would readily do this if the alternative were the establishment of a Government examination which would deprive the University of a valuable source of revenue.

Paragraph 173.—Honours. I think that two or perhaps three classes for the ordinary degree should suffice, leaving the M. A. degree to give the specialized honours.

Paragraph 177.—Examiners. The difficulty as to a teacher examining in the subject he teaches would be entirely got rid of if the examiners for one University were teachers in colleges affiliated to another University as proposed in Simla Conference Resolution No. 33. This proposal would of course be objected to unless the exchange in examiners was so fairly conducted that each examiner would get as large a fee for examining students of another University as he would for examining those of his own. Such a system would also lead to more inter-communication between the different Universities. The Boards of Examiners could meet for consultation as at present, but the candidates would not be those of another University.

I agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson in paragraphs 27, 28, 29 of his note.

A. T. A [RUNDEL],—26-8-02.

The longer that one resides in India the more difficult it is to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to whether Government has acted wisely in putting such high education within the reach of a class who, with great receptive qualities and an extraordinary power of assimilating knowledge at a very early age, are, taking them generally, strangely deficient in the power of adapting their acquirements to purposes either useful to themselves or to the benefit of other people.

It is presumably the recognition of this fact that has called for the assembly of the Indian Universities Commission to advise on the necessary reforms; and the systematic way in which University education in India is now being grappled with must be beneficial to a

country which annually produces a redundancy of young East Indian students, many of whose chief claim to even subordinate clerical appointments is that they are "failed B. As.," or that they have "failed Middle."

I cordially endorse the opinion of His Excellency the Viceroy that a breed of 19-year old B. As. should not be encouraged, and that the Entrance age-limit should be raised, and I consider that anything else that can be done to as much as possible restrict high education to those whom it will really benefit by making them more useful citizens is a consummation devoutly to be wished; so that, after taking degrees and finding no suitable employment, they may not be led, as is too often the case, to parade their knowledge and air their acquirements by disseminating sedition through the columns of the native press, which, though it may be comparatively harmless as yet when indulged in by an effete race of southerners, may in time be a source of real danger if it spreads more in the course of years to the fighting classes of the north.

As regards the report of the Commission, I most cordially endorse the Viceroy's remarks in His Excellency's note of 20th July 1902 (pages 11 and 12), paragraphs 46, 48, 49, 50, 53 and 54, and the Hon'ble Mr. Ibbetson's note of 7th August 1902 (page 22), paragraph 14, and consequently am not in accord with the Hon'ble Mr. Raleigh's note of 28th July 1902 (page 19), paragraph 19. In the final paragraph of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note he alludes to the study of "English History" only, but surely a study of the Ancient History of India, in a knowledge of which many Indians are sadly deficient, is, together with a study of Eastern as well of Western Art, worthy of the time spent upon it.

That the opportunities available for technical education are not more readily seized by the youth of the country is not a healthy sign of the times, and I should like to see pressure brought to bear to render such education, if not more generally compulsory, at any rate that it shall be insisted on as a qualification for preferment in certain cases. As I have stated in Council, the Dutch in Netherlands India, where I had an opportunity of studying their systems, are able to enforce technical education. Their style of Government is perhaps more patriarchal and not so free and enlightened as ours, though possibly in some ways more suited to the governed. The heirs of land-owners should, in my opinion, be compulsorily instructed in the developments of machinery as applied to Agricultural Science and also in Arboriculture, so that by the use of Western inventions more could be got out of the land. As an instance in the matter of forage alone, which affects the Army and might considerably affect expenditure in time of war, millions of tons of hay that now run to waste could be saved by scientific farming and the use of pressing machines placed close to railway lines.

A. P. P[ALMER],—27-8-02.

I understand that the Report of the Universities Commission will be referred to Local Governments before any Resolution is recorded by the Government of India. In making the reference, we may, I suggest, express at least a provisional opinion on the more important recommendations, and indicate the points on which we require advice.

2. Since the Report was published, it has been criticised in the Public Press, and some leading members of the Universities have made observations upon it. Among those who are best qualified to judge, there is a disposition to accept the recommendations, subject to modification in details. In some quarters the proposals of the Commission are regarded with alarm, and it is contended that if these proposals are accepted, the death-knell of higher education will be sounded, the private colleges will cease to exist, and the opportunities now offered to students and especially poor students, will be very seriously restricted. It is also represented that the object of the Commission has been to bring the higher education under the control of Government, and to deprive the Universities of the measure of independence which they now enjoy. In answer to these assertions, it may be well to point out that the private colleges were strongly represented on the Commission, and that there is nothing in the Report which indicates hostility to them or indifference to their interests. The Commission recommend that the standard of efficiency for all colleges should be raised, but they are of opinion that the process of improvement must be gradual, and that all existing interests must be respected (paragraph 198).

3. I suggest that the substance of the foregoing paragraph of this note may be included in our letter to Local Governments. There is no need to ignore the newspaper campaign against the Report, and our remarks may in part be directed to answering the misrepresentations put forward by hostile critics. With some such preface we may pass to the points of the Report.

4. *Teaching Universities.*—We shall no doubt concur as to the legal powers of the Universities: we must also, I fear, concur as to the impossibility of establishing a University Professoriate. As to the proposed Central Schools, we might say that we attach importance to any suggestion for the encouragement of postgraduate study, and ask for information as to (1) the subjects which may be taken up, (2) the resources available and (3) the extent to which local colleges may be willing to co-operate.

5. *Local limits and proposed new Universities.*—These are points on which each Local Government must be separately addressed.

6. *The Senate*.—We may say that academic opinion is almost unanimous as to the expediency of reducing the number. We should consult the Local Governments as to the adequacy of the number suggested by the Commission in each University. If the reduction is carried out as proposed, we may ask for advice as to the willingness of existing Fellows to accept the position of Honorary Fellows.

We may refer to the argument that a five years' tenure will not be favourable to independence, and say that we do not see reason for this apprehension. We may also note that the Report proposes an understanding as to attendance at meetings, and ask whether the understanding should be re-enforced by a rule rendering a Fellow liable to deprivation in case of non-attendance for a year (as suggested by Mr. Ibbetson).

If His Excellency in Council thinks that the Commission has not given a sufficient number of places to elected Fellows, we may ask a question about this.

7. There is perhaps nothing under *Faculties and Boards of Studies* on which we have to consult Local Governments generally. When we come to *The Syndicate* we may ask them whether they agree with the Commission in preferring a small Syndicate, and whether they are of opinion that a body, constituted as proposed, will be able to exercise powers of inspection and control over colleges. Whether we accept the whole scheme outlined in paragraph 51 of the Report or not, we may expect that the more central and more important colleges will be strongly represented on the new Syndicate. Up to now the colleges have been isolated, and they do not like the notion of being visited by the Principals or Professors of rival institutions. For my own part, I am convinced that there must be some system of inspection, and that the system should be worked by the University, not by the Education Department. I would leave the Syndicates a free hand in details, only insisting that everything must be done to conciliate the colleges, and to make them understand that they are inspected only with a view to the maintenance of a general standard of efficiency. The Syndicate may depute its own members or any competent persons to visit colleges; they may ask the Director of Public Instruction to keep them informed as to colleges which he is able to visit when he is on tour. But in one way or in another the Syndicate must have a direct knowledge of teachers and students in all the institutions under its control.

In this matter we are not without experience to guide us. Allahabad has made rules for colleges which desire to obtain affiliation in Science. In applying these rules, the Syndicate is guided by the report of two Professors. I saw the protest addressed to the two inspecting Professors by the Principal of a college which had failed to obtain affiliation in Physics. When the Inspectors pointed out, in a friendly tone, that the University required certain provision to be made for practical work, and that such provision had not in fact been made, the protest was dropped.

8. The proposals under *Registrar, Libraries and Graduates* do not seem to call for further remark. But the whole section of the Report which relates to *Affiliated Colleges* is of cardinal importance.

I strongly support the suggestion that members of the Syndicate should visit the colleges. My honourable colleague, Mr. Arundel, seems to think this is the business of experts; but here I would make a distinction. If, e.g., the question is, whether a chemical laboratory is up to the mark or no, none but an expert can decide. But any man of affairs (Mr. Arundel himself, for instance, or Sir Bhashyam Aiyengar) can say whether the college and its hostels are in good condition, whether the relations between teachers and students are satisfactory, whether there is a sound *esprit de corps*. In all such matters, one can find out more in an hour spent in the place than can be learned from pages of statistics. My experience is, that the small colleges are delighted to see any visitor of high official rank, and that they do not resent criticism, if only they feel that the critic sympathises with their aims and makes allowance for their difficulties.

9. The question of *Fees* will require careful consideration. There can be no doubt that underselling does exist, and it is hard to see how the practice can be prevented unless power is taken to prescribe fees. The assertion that the Commission propose to exclude poor students generally from the benefits of the higher education is wholly unfounded—see the passage in paragraph 71, beginning—“No poor but really able student should be excluded,” etc.

10. Again, the proposals as to *Transfers* are framed to prevent evils of the first magnitude, and we should, I think, support them, while leaving it open to Local Governments to express an opinion.

The proposals under *College and School* for the disaffiliation of second-grade colleges have been much criticised, and in view of what my honourable colleagues have written, I desire to be guided by the discussion in Council. As at present advised, I think the policy of the Commission is sound, but I should like to see it carried out very gradually, and after careful consultation with local authorities. We desire to get rid of the system under which a flourishing school throws out a college department by adding a few classes at the top of the school. The Commission speaks of a “reasonable limit of time” and counsels respect for existing interests. If the main idea—the necessity of distinguishing schools from colleges—be accepted, what is most wanted is co-operation and better management of existing resources. There must always be

competition, but great mischief is wrought under present conditions, especially in Bengal, by rivalry between schools, so that in many cases we have several small college departments where we ought to have one good college.

12. In passing to the section on *Teaching*, we ought, I think, to say that the Commission must not be taken to recommend that the courses of study in all Universities should be arranged on a uniform plan. They have rather endeavoured to indicate the principles by which University authorities should be guided, the defects which they have observed in methods of teaching, and the steps which are to be taken to simplify and complete the programme of instruction. A similar remark applies to the whole section on *Examinations*. What the Commission aimed at was not the construction of a model programme, to be imposed on all the Universities, but a statement of the objects to be kept in view when new regulations are framed for each University.

13. Subject to the observations made in the preceding paragraph, I would ask in general terms for an opinion on the recommendations of the Commission.

14. *Law Teaching*.—The proposals of the Commission have been violently attacked, and it may be well to offer some explanation. In the first place, we may agree with the Commission as to the defects of existing arrangements. The Law Department of a Mofussil College in Bengal and elsewhere usually consists of one lecturer, who is supposed to undertake the eight subjects of the B. L. degree; there is usually no law library to which students have access, and they are not required to do any exercises. The defence made on behalf of the system is, that the students do not go to law lectures to learn, but to obtain the required percentage of attendances, and that they can master all their subjects in six-months' private reading.

The Commission propose that a Central Law College should be established in each University. This has been done at Madras, Bombay and Lahore; but in all cases the Local Government should be consulted as to the necessity for such a college and the possibility of making it self supporting.

The Commission do not propose that the Central Law College should have a monopoly. On the contrary, any college will be able to obtain affiliation in Law, provided that it can bring its Law Department up to the standard of efficiency as laid down in the Report. Some of the Calcutta Colleges command the services of teachers who are well qualified in point of learning. The question for them will be, whether they will co-operate in the creation of a Central College, or retain their independence and create a *bond fide* centre of legal teaching within their own walls.

15. *University Funds*.—We should, I think, consult Local Governments on the proposal, to raise University examination fees. We must also ask them to advise on the suggestion that "by Government aid or otherwise" the financial position of the Universities should be strengthened. The Commission, being only an advisory body, was obliged to state this serious question for the consideration of Government without attempting to solve it.

16. *Legislation*.—When the chief questions have been considered by His Excellency in Council, I think it will be possible to draft a Bill which may be sent to Local Governments, with an intimation that it is prepared for the purpose of giving precision to the scheme.

The task of framing new regulations will be a difficult one. Drafts, I think, would have to be prepared, and each draft might be revised by a Committee, the Government of India nominating the Chairman and one member, the Local Government one member, and the local Senate two. If this plan is approved in Council, we may perhaps suggest it to Local Governments and ask for opinions.

17. The letter to Local Governments can hardly be a circular, as the questions referred will be to some extent special. I subjoin a rough note of the points which concern each separately:—

Bengal.—We may cordially approve the proposal to make the Lieutenant-Governor Rector of the University: inquire as to number of Calcutta Senate and proposed mode of appointment. The question of Law Teaching will have to be stated with some reference to the discontinuance of the Presidency College law lectures, and the unsatisfactory results of the present system in Calcutta and the Mofussil.

Madras.—In some points (residence of students and transfers) the Madras rules are the best: some reference to this may be desirable, as we are asking them to give up some Madras customs (recognition of vernaculars in B. A. courses: examination by compartments). Second-grade colleges are numerous, and that part of the question requires special consideration.

Bombay.—The proposal for a Central School of Science at Bombay has some support; we may ask for information as to the possibilities of such a scheme.

United Provinces.—Allahabad has made affiliation rules in Science, and we should ask for information as to their working. The proposal to found Central Schools at University head-quarters was supported by the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Justice Knox, and we may expect

to receive some estimate of ways and means from Allahabad. The Local Government is prepared to deal with the proposal for a Medical College.

Punjab.—We shall have to deal carefully with the “compact” as it is called on which the Punjab University is founded, and to make it clear that we do not intend to discourage the vernaculars in any way, but rather to encourage native scholarship more effectively than in the past. Something special may perhaps be said as to the need for affiliation rules and rules for private students.

Burma.—It is for consideration whether we need consult Burma and the rest on constitutional questions relating to Calcutta. We may ask how far the existing Calcutta arrangements suit them, and concur in the opinion of the Commission as to the proposed new University.

Central Provinces.—We may concur in the reasons given for thinking the projected University is not yet needed, and give an opportunity to express an opinion on the proposed assignment of Nagpur and Jubbulpore to Allahabad.

Assam.—It is possible that Mr. Fuller may wish to say something of the needs of the Province. There are, I think, two colleges, both second grade, one at Sylhet and one recently affiliated at Gauhati.

18. There are a great many questions not touched upon in this note, and I have not attempted to deal with the suggestions made by my honourable colleagues. I have merely endeavoured to indicate the points which ought to be considered before we address Local Governments.

T. R[ALEIGH],—30-8-02.

I do not think that I can usefully add any remarks at the present stage, except that I should be inclined to address a general letter to all Local Governments, which I would publish, supplementing it by separate letters dealing with special points. There is a good deal that it is expedient for us to say publicly at the earliest opportunity.

DENZIL I[BBETSON],—31-8-02.

Order in Council.

That a draft letter to Local Governments and Administrations be prepared, based on the discussion in Council and the notes.

C[URZON],—5-9-02.

I explained to His Excellency yesterday the state of this case and received his instructions to submit the draft letter to Local Governments, inviting opinions on certain of the recommendations of the Universities Commission, without waiting for the draft Bill which (as was settled in Council) was to be annexed to the letter with the object of giving precision to the views of the Government of India or, at any rate, of indicating the form which their views would ultimately assume.

2. The draft letter has been discussed with the Honourable Mr. Raleigh and Mr. Orange and the proof of 24th September below show the alterations made in consultation with them. The changes since made explain themselves and are concurred in by Mr. Orange.

3. The draft Bill has reached me this morning. I understand from Mr. Raleigh that it follows the recommendations of the Commission and that it will be modified hereafter so as to embody the final conclusions of the Government of India when the terms of the letter have been settled.

4. The only points in the draft Bill on which I need offer any remarks are (i) the appointment of Fellows and (ii) the procedure for disaffiliation.

5. Section 4 of the Bill deals with the appointment of Fellows. Sub-section (5) follows the system described in paragraph 5 of the note by the Honourable Mr. Raleigh and Mr. Hewett of 24th July and not the alternative method suggested by Honourable Member in paragraph 3 of his note of 7th August and concurred in by the Honourable Mr. Arundel. It was decided in Council that the point was not to be referred to Local Governments. It was reserved for further discussion in Council and His Excellency intimated his intention of consulting the Chancellors of the University on the subject.

6. Section 15 of the Bill gives the Syndicate full and independent authority in the matter

I understand that the Bill is subject to revision of disaffiliation and is not in accord with the line when our letter is finally settled.

DENZIL I[BBETSON].

which is to conciliate popular feeling by conceding a point which, as the ultimate decision must in any case rest with Government, is not really essential. From this point of view I venture to submit that section 15 (1) will be criticised on the grounds (1) that it places an individual in a very invidious position ; (2) that it offers an opening for persons to attack rival institutions ; (3) that it will be a dead-letter because no one will like to take action under it. I do not say these objections are conclusive, but they are pretty certain to be taken. They might be avoided if the section were so framed as to provide (a) for *collective* action by the Syndicate ; (b) for such action being taken as the result of inspection by members of the Syndicate, or by experts deputed by the Syndicate, or of reports, special or periodical, called for by the Syndicate.

7. Such inspection or reports would give the Syndicate a *prima facie* case. They would then state the case on the data before them and proceed as in sub-sections (2) and (3). Their proceedings would be of a *quasi-judicial* character. When they had decided for disaffiliation, I cannot see that any harm would be done by the case being referred to the Senate, the proviso being added that if the Senate did not agree with the Syndicate, the difference of opinion should be reported to the Government by the Vice-Chancellor or his *locum tenens*. In Bengal a

I would not bring the Lieutenant-Governor in further air of impartiality might be given to the as Rector. He should come in as Local Govern- procedure by invoking the Rector's intervention to ment, whom we should probably consult.

DENZIL I[BBETSON].

forward the case to the Governor-General in

Council. All possible points of view would then have been represented and a college which was disaffiliated could not complain that its case had been tried *in camera* by a jury on which its rivals were strongly represented.

8. One more point occurs to me. It would, I submit, be advisable to say something in the letter about the machinery for making regulations under section 16. People are certain to read that section as indicating an intention on the part of Government to frame a 'Draconian' code to bind the universities, and they will assume, unless the contrary is explained, that the universities themselves will have no share in the making of the regulations. I understand that the Honourable Mr. Raleigh has considered the question [which owing to the great range of subjects covered by section 16(2) is a very difficult one] and has definite proposals to make. If so, I think these should be included in the letter and the opinions of Local Governments taken.

H. H. RISLEY,--8-10-02.

I think that Mr. Risley has given us a most admirable draft, for which we should be grateful to him. The tone seems to me exactly what is wanted, and I think that its publication will have an excellent effect. I have suggested a few small alterations, and some substantial additions.

2. I have left standing, for His Excellency's consideration, Mr. Risley's proposed manuscript addition to paragraph 10 of the draft. But I would certainly cut it out.* It is based upon the notes in the separate case of a scale of minimum fees for schools in Madras. But Madras has an automatic system by which low fees in aided schools are penalised, which exist in no other provinces. And our suggestion was in some measure a concession to the strongly-expressed views of the Local Governments. I certainly would not extend the suggestion (especially without the system) to the whole of India.

3. I have marginally noted two points for Secretary's consideration on paragraphs 15 and 23 of the draft. But these can be disposed of after His Excellency has seen the draft, the submission of which should not be delayed.

4. I now turn to the draft Bill. I do not think Secretary is right in saying that it was settled in Council to annex the Bill to the letter. My recollection is that His Excellency expressed a doubt whether it would be advisable to publish the Bill with the letter, and that I suggested that the point might be decided when we had seen the Bill. On the whole, I advise that the Bill be treated separately from the letter, and not published at present. In the first place, I understand from paragraphs 3 and 8 of Secretary's note above, that there is still a good deal to be done in connection with the draft. Now I consider it on every ground advisable to get our letter out at once. In the second place, there is no doubt in my mind that the extensive powers which the Bill gives to Government—especially in the matter of the initial remodelling of the Regulations [section 16 (1)] will be violently attacked by the Native Press. Some such powers are essential. But I would submit our proposals, in the first instance, to the criticism of Local Governments only. Of course the Bill in its final form will be published ; and it is not improbable that the contents of the draft Bill leak out and possibly form the subject of comment. But I would not submit our proposals in this matter to the public, and invite criticism upon them, until we have finally made up our minds as to the form which they are to take and the extent to which it is wise and necessary to go. That we cannot do till we have the opinions of Local Governments on both the letters and the draft Bill.

5. I would cut out the last paragraph of the letter and issue and publish it at once. I think it might be published in the Gazette. I would then revise the Bill as may be necessary, and send it, some six weeks after

C[URZON]. the issue of the letter, to Local Governments, with a letter something in the sense of the excised paragraph. I notice below some points of importance which I think might be altered with advantage in the Bill.

6. *Section 4 (2).*—I would limit the new and smaller Senate to members of the existing

one. It will be quite enough to have to weed out a large proportion of the existing Fellows, without bringing in new men, everyone of whom would exclude one of the present Fellows.

C[URZON].

7. *Section 4 (5).*—My recollection of what took place in Council does not quite coincide with Secretary's. What I think that His Excellency reserved for discussion with the other Chancellors when the time came was the *manner* in which the weeding out of Fellows should be carried out—whether the initial weeding out, or the annual retirement of one-fifth of (1) the nominated and (2) the elected Fellows. I think that section 4 (5) should provide—

(a) that the Fellows nominated under section 4 (1) shall retain office for a period of three years, and after that until I am in general agreement with Honourable Member. retired as below; and

C[URZON].

(b) that as nearly as may be one-fifth of them shall vacate office at the end of the third and of each subsequent year, the individuals to retire on each occasion except the last being selected by the Chancellor, or in such manner as he may direct. It is not improbable that the ballot may be resorted to, at any rate in the case of elected Fellows; and the section as drafted would render this impossible, since it requires all the annual retirements to be settled before the appointments are made.

* So do I.

C[URZON].

8. I agree with what Secretary says about section 15 (1) of the draft in paragraph 6 of his note.*

9. I should be inclined to add in section 16 (1) after "the Governor General in Council," the words "after consulting the Senate and the Local Governments."†

C[URZON].

10. I find no provision in the draft Bill for the initial revision of the affiliation list which is to form part of our process of reformation—see paragraph 15 of the draft letter.

11. Now please submit the case to His Excellency at once.

DENZIL I[BBETSON],—9-10-02.

In the tremendous pressure of work at the close of the Simla season, some days have elapsed before I have been able minutely and exhaustively to go through the draft. I concur with Mr. Ibbetson in his general estimate of its skilful and appropriate composition.

I have made a number of corrections or additions which explain themselves.

As regards the draft Bill, Mr. Ibbetson is entirely right. I never contemplated for a moment issuing a draft Bill at the present stage *for publication*. Indeed our Order in Council was specifically confined to a draft letter. To publish a draft Bill now would be singularly unwise, for (1) its present form reflects the recommendations of the Commission, rather than our matured opinions; (2) the form which will be taken by the Bill, even in its first shape (*i.e.*, upon introduction), will be dependent upon the answer received to the present letter; (3) the publication of so essentially immature a draft would only alarm public opinion, and would destroy the entire effect of our reassuring circular; by creating a fresh batch of apprehensions, as excited (even though unreasonable) as these, which we now hope to allay.

The draft Bill needs a good deal of careful revision: in the sense indicated in the notes of Secretary and Honourable Member and also perhaps in other directions. This should be done in the course of the next few weeks: and towards the close of my tour (end of November) a revised draft should be sent to me, which I will bring up in Council (if this be found necessary) upon my return to Calcutta in the first week of December, and which can then issue (not for publication) to Local Governments.

As the draft Bill will not accompany the present letter, I have added a concluding paragraph to the latter, which at present has no finalo.

The letter can now be reprinted, and a copy sent to each Honourable Member for information. I would then propose that it be issued without further delay and published in the Gazette of next Saturday (October 25th).

C[URZON],—19-10-02.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 921 H. D.—14-11-1902.—40.

FROM

H. H. RISLEY, Esq., C.I.E.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of India,

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.
,, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY,
EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.
,, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL,
GENERAL (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.
,, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
UNITED PROVINCES,
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.
,, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB,
HOME (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.
,, SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BURMA.
,, HONOURABLE THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE
CENTRAL PROVINCES.
,, HONOURABLE THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF ASSAM.
,, CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF COORG.
,, HONOURABLE THE RESIDENT AT HYDERABAD.

Home Department.
Education.



Simla, the 24 October 1902.

SIR,

IN continuation of the letter from the Government of India, No. 664—673, dated the 2nd August 1902, forwarding copies of the Report of the Indian Universities Commission, I am directed to communicate the following observations of the Governor General in Council on certain points dealt with in the Report and to state that His Excellency in Council will be glad to be furnished at an early date with the views of the Governor in Council His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor your views on the recommendations of the Commission.

2. During the last three years the attention of the Government of India has been specially directed to the problems connected with University education in this country. A consensus of opinion has pronounced that the system adopted experimentally in India nearly half a century ago, while it has been responsible for great strides in higher education, has also developed anomalies and even abuses, arising in the main from too close an adherence to lines of working, which are not altogether suited to the conditions of the present day, and from which the best educational thought of the time has shown an increasing tendency to separate itself. In order to carry the examination of this problem to a practical issue, a Commission was appointed by a Resolution of the Government of India, dated the 27th January 1902, to inquire into the condition and prospects of the Universities established in British India; to consider and report upon any proposals which have been, or may be, made for improving their constitution and working; and to recommend to the Governor General in Council such measures as may tend to elevate the standard of University teaching, and to promote the advancement of learning.

3. The Commission travelled and held sittings between the 18th February and the 18th April 1902, and within that period 156 witnesses were examined and its method of inquiry.

many colleges and institutions affiliated to the Universities were visited. The Report of the Commission, which has already been published, has been read by the Governor General in Council with much interest and advantage. In the opinion of His Excellency in Council it covers with accuracy and fulness (but with sufficient condensation) the entire ground which they were invited to traverse. It exposes faithfully, but without undue severity, the defects of the present system of University education ; it outlines a comprehensive scheme of administrative and legislative reform ; and it testifies to a laborious and minute investigation of the subject by the President and his colleagues which His Excellency in Council has much pleasure in acknowledging. The position occupied by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Banerjee and his high authority in educational matters lend great weight, not only to his Note of Dissent, but also to the many recommendations of the Commission in which he agrees.

4. In the present communication the Governor General in Council considers it desirable in the first instance to disclaim ^{Attitude of Government towards higher education.} emphatically any intention of receding

from the policy set forth in the Educational Despatch of 1854, and affirmed by the Education Commission of 1882, that it is important to encourage private enterprise in the matter of education, both because to do so shifts a larger proportion of the cost on to the shoulders of those who should properly bear it, and because private enterprise is peculiarly competent to adapt education to the varying needs and conditions of different places and different times. This policy was deliberately accepted at the time by the Government of India, and their adherence to it remains unshaken.

5. But the sole condition upon which private enterprise can be encouraged is, that the education which it offers is reasonably efficient ; by which is meant, not that it follows any prescribed set of rules or courses of study, but that discipline is enforced, good morals inculcated, and adequate provision made for instruction. Inferior education at cheap rates is in all countries a snare to parents, and a danger to their children ; and it is especially so in India, where Western education is of such recent origin. It is the bounden duty of Government, with regard to schools, and of the Universities (which derive their authority from Government) with regard to colleges, to do all that lies in their power to discourage methods of tuition that sacrifice efficiency to popularity, and that lower, instead of progressively elevating, the educational ideals of the nation.

6. In the existing circumstances of education in India, the standard of efficiency which it is proper and possible to enforce is admittedly not so high as that which is attained in more advanced countries. But it should be the constant endeavour of Government to raise it, not so as to deprive the children of the country of the means of education, but to protect them, so far as may be, against wasting the only years of their lives during which education is possible. The most dangerous enemy to legitimate private enterprise in matters educational is the school or college which reduces expenditure to a point at which efficiency is impossible, and thus tempts parents to take their boys from soundly conducted institutions, and to send them where the training they receive is both inferior and cheap. To discourage such institutions is the most practically effectual method of encouraging all such private enterprise as is deserving of encouragement ; and it is to this end that many of the most important changes now proposed are directed.

7. The Government of India confidently anticipate that the majority of the changes recommended by the Commission will have the effect of improving the quality and enlarging the scope of all forms of higher education in India ; that they will open to the youth of the country lines of activity and prospects of employment for which their present training fails to equip them ; that they will directly promote the intellectual advancement of the upper classes, and will both directly and indirectly lead to the development of the resources and industries of India.

8. In recommending to the Secretary of State and in ordering, with his approval, the publication of the Report as soon as possible after its submission, the intention of the Government of

Full criticism invited.

India was to evoke the fullest and freest expression of opinion, not only from Governments and officials, but also from individuals, representative bodies, and the public press, so that before arriving at a final decision they might be in possession of the views of all persons interested in the future of education in India. Of the criticisms which have so far come before them, the most numerous and the most vigorous are directed against the proposal to fix a minimum rate of fees to be levied in affiliated colleges, and the proposals in respect of the institutions known as second grade colleges. I am accordingly, in the first place, to direct attention to these subjects.

9. The proposals of the Commission in respect of fees are contained in paragraphs 71 and 75 of their Report and

The question of minimum fees.

are examined by the Hon'ble Mr.

Justice Banerjee in paragraphs 13 to 15 of his Note of Dissent. The Government of India are disposed to think that there has been some misapprehension as to the views of the Commission. It seems to have been imagined that one of the objects of their proposals was to exclude poor students as such from the benefits of higher education. But in paragraph 71 of the Report they observe that no poor but really able student should be excluded by reason of his poverty from the advantages of the highest education, and in paragraph 73 they lay stress on the necessity, when fixing a minimum rate of fee, of taking into account not only the local circumstances and the demand for higher education, but also the ability of the students to pay adequate fees for the higher forms of instruction. The question is not free from difficulty and will require careful consideration. In the opinion of the Governor General in Council the main argument in favour of fixing a minimum scale of fees is to be sought in the facts set forth in paragraph 73 of the Report. At some of the unaided colleges it was found that the Professors and teachers were inadequately paid, that the buildings and class-rooms were unsuitable, that the educational appliances for general teaching were inadequate, and that the apparatus and laboratories for science and other special teaching were of the most primitive description, and not even suited to the requirements of an ordinary board or primary school in England, or in Europe generally. In the case of Government and aided schools, the avowed policy of Government is gradually to raise the fee until the student pays a reasonable proportion of the cost of an education which has a high commercial value, due provision being made by means of scholarships for the case of poor but clever students. The minimum scale of fees is fixed somewhat lower in aided than in Government institutions so as to prevent the latter from competing unfairly with the former. Now it will not be contended that aided colleges (a very substantial proportion of the expenditure on which is borne by Government) have in all cases reached an extravagant standard of efficiency. And if this be so, it follows that in colleges, which are unaided and unendowed, which enjoy no Government grant, and which have a lower scale of fees, the efficiency must be still lower. Nor can it be admitted for a moment that unaided colleges as such are entitled to claim unqualified freedom of action in a matter of this kind. By granting them affiliation, and by admitting their students to examinations leading up to degrees, the Universities confer upon such colleges the most valuable of academic privileges, and thus establish their right to impose such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent the competitive underselling of educational advantages. That such underselling exists, in a greater or less degree, in several parts of India is beyond dispute, and it is hard to see how it can be prevented without placing some restriction on the undue lowering of fees. It may indeed be argued that efficiency can be insisted on by the threat of disaffiliation. But efficiency is difficult to measure, its estimation is open to dispute, and the principle that, with a fee-scale below a certain limit, efficiency in a college without considerable endowments or subscriptions is impossible, and may, therefore, be presumed not to be attained, is one for which there is much to be said. In inviting

the Governor in Council
the opinion of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor
 your opinion I am to repeat that nothing can be further from the intentions of the Government of India or of the Commission than to initiate a policy which would tend to make education the monopoly of the rich. It is obvious that all education cannot be equally good: some colleges and schools will always be better than others. But there is a certain minimum standard of efficiency with which all institutions ought to conform. The maintenance of that standard involves expenditure which cannot be reduced beyond a certain point and which entails the charging of fees which some of the would-be students may find difficulty in paying. The needs of this class may be met in two ways: (i) by the provision of scholarships for the more able boys; (ii) by means of endowed schools and colleges which will cheapen education for all poor students irrespective of their ability. Of the latter form of aid there are numerous examples in Europe, and the Governor General in Council trusts that one result of the Commission will be to promote the foundation of similar beneficent institutions in this country. India as a country is not rich, but there are many rich men in India, and they can devote their wealth to no more excellent purpose than the provision of some measure of higher education for the poorer students who, from whatever cause, are left behind in the race for scholarships.

10. In paragraph 77 of their Report the Commission explain that the so-called second grade colleges are for the most part only high schools which have added to their course two college classes teaching up to the standard of the F. A. Examination but no further. With the object of marking more clearly the dividing line between school and college life, and securing the generally desirable object that University students should receive their education in colleges properly so called, and that school boys and college students should not receive instruction in the same building and under the same set of rules, the Commission recommend that no new second grade colleges should be affiliated, and that those existing colleges which cannot hope to rise to the first grade by adding classes teaching up to the B. A. degree should revert to the position of high schools. They do not, however, suggest that the latter change should be made at once. They would leave it to each University to determine a reasonable time within which it can be effected, and they suggest that due regard should be paid to existing interests. In fact they contemplate their policy being carried out very gradually, and after careful consultation with the local authorities.

11. However gradual the process may be, and however cautiously it may be undertaken, the Government of India cannot but recognise that the change proposed will be a large one and that many interests will be affected. No doubt some reform is required. There is abundant evidence that under present conditions great mischief is wrought, especially in Bengal, by rivalry between schools, with the result that in many places the true interests of education suffer and the prospects of students are impaired by the maintenance of several small college departments where there ought to be one good college. But there is something to be said on the other side. The Government of India are not at present convinced that the practice by which a flourishing school extends the scope of its efforts so as to include the F. A., of itself deserves condemnation, provided always that the teaching and equipment of the college classes is thoroughly efficient up to the limits of the course which they teach. Under the peculiar conditions which prevail in India such classes may indeed serve a useful purpose in several ways. Not only do they cheapen a particular stage of education which many students are unable to pursue further; they also in many cases defer the separation of a student from his family, a point to which Indian parents rightly attach much importance. It must be borne in mind that the student enters upon his college course at a younger age in India than in England; in the absence of proper hostels no effective supervision is provided for him in strange and trying surroundings; and the anxiety of his parents to postpone the day of his departure for a large town at a distance is therefore reasonable in itself and deserves sympathetic consideration on the part of Government. To enforce with strictness the recommendations of the Commission might in many cases lead to the substitution of

an inferior first grade for a good second grade college. And a second grade college is often only an intermediate and necessary step towards the formation of a first grade college. The fact which lies at the root of the matter is, that owing to the special conditions of India, the two years of the First Arts Course, which are in other countries the last two years of school life, have been here included in the college course. In time it should be possible to remedy this defect. Meanwhile, the Government of India incline to the opinion that, so long as efficiency is strictly insisted upon, second grade colleges occupy a definite place in the educational machinery of the country, and fulfil a useful function.

12. I am to ask that the Government of India may be favoured with a full expression of ^{the opinion of} ~~the Governor in Council~~ ^{His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor} ~~your opinion~~ on this important subject, with special reference to the circumstances of ^{Madras} ~~Bombay, etc.~~ and of particular localities.

13. The question of the retention of second grade colleges really forms part of the larger question of the affiliation and disaffiliation of colleges generally. The proposals of the Commission on this important subject may conveniently be brought together here. They recommend that before affiliation is granted, a college should be required to conform to the following tests:—

- (a) Desirability of the institution to be certified by the Director of Public Instruction.
- (b) Assurance to be given as to its financial stability.
- (c) Creation of a properly constituted governing body.
- (d) Provision of an adequate teaching staff with a common room for their meetings.
- (e) Provision of suitable and healthy buildings.
- (f) Where possible (though of course this cannot be made a condition of affiliation) residence of the Principals and Professors in close proximity to the college.
- (g) Adequate provision for the residence of students in college lodgings or in hostels, and for their supervision by a resident Superintendent.
- (h) Satisfactory guarantees as to the subjects and courses of study.
- (i) Introduction of a scale of minimum fees, free-studentships being as a general rule debarred, and State and private scholarships encouraged.
- (j) Existence and enforcement of proper transfer rules.
- (k) No new second grade college to be affiliated.

14. On all of these points except one—the introduction of a scale of minimum fees—the recommendations of the Commission are unanimous, and their unanimity carries immense weight. They have laid down in clear and unequivocal terms the standard of efficiency which all Indian colleges may reasonably be expected to maintain. How is conformity with that standard to be secured (a) in the case of new institutions, (b) in the case of existing colleges? The former case presents no difficulty. The Commission agree that the question of admitting new institutions to affiliation is, in the first instance, one for the Syndicate, who will make the necessary enquiries and will procure an independent report from the Director of Public Instruction or some other competent authority. They will then submit the application to Government, with their recommendation and the grounds for it, and Government will pass final orders. The Government of India regard the suggestion that affiliation should in future be granted in specified courses or subjects, as especially valuable. As regards colleges on which the privilege of affiliation has already been conferred, the Commission are unanimous in recommending that no such institution should be allowed to fall below the standard of efficiency required, and they refer to cases brought before them of colleges which obtained affiliation on statements showing an adequate staff which was afterwards

allowed to deteriorate. When once the standard of efficiency has been clearly defined, the question must arise how far existing institutions comply with it in respect of each of the various courses which they teach. The determination of this important question will be an undertaking of some magnitude, and it does not follow that it can be approached in the same manner everywhere. It is possible that in some of the Universities it may most conveniently be dealt with by the Syndicate on the basis of information furnished by the Director of Public Instruction and supplemented by their own inspections and inquiries. This mode of procedure has the advantage of being in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission, and with the position which they propose to assign to the Syndicate in future. But it seems probable that the task of examining into the circumstances of all existing institutions will prove too heavy for the Syndicate to accomplish unaided within any reasonable time. In that case it seems to the Governor General in Council that the best plan will be for the Chancellor of each University to appoint a strong and representative Committee of the Senate to consider and report direct to him what institutions, whether of the first or second grade, are qualified to retain their privilege of affiliation in respect of all or some of the courses which they teach, and to make such recommendations as they consider to be called for in each case as to the improvements which are necessary and the period within which they should be introduced. The mere appointment of such a Committee would of itself exercise great influence and would probably induce most of the institutions which now fall short of the standard to comply with its requirements of their own motion. The remaining cases would be dealt with by the Committee on the merits, and their recommendations would be considered by the Chancellor, and eventually by Government, the fullest allowance being made for the circumstances of each institution, and for the fact that a new departure is now being taken, and a more exacting standard of efficiency prescribed. The Government of India are above all things anxious that the reforms now proposed should be introduced with the utmost circumspection, and that all reasonable concessions should be made in order to avoid dealing harshly with institutions which have in the past made *bond fide* attempts to work up to the standards that have hitherto obtained.

15. The ground having been thus cleared by the enquiries and recommendations of the Syndicate or proposed Committee, and the action taken upon them by the Chancellor, it may be hoped that the question of withdrawing the privilege of affiliation will seldom arise in the future, and that if the Syndicate make wise use of their power of inspection, a warning from them will be sufficient to induce a college to carry out the improvements required. Should it, in an exceptional case, be necessary to resort to extreme measures, the Government of India are disposed to think that the case, with the recommendation of the Syndicate upon it, should be brought before the Senate, and that their opinion should be submitted to Government by the Syndicate, with such further comments and explanations as the latter body may consider to be necessary in order to present a complete view of the case. The Governor General in Council will be glad to be favoured with

the opinion of the Governor in Council
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on the points discussed above.
your opinion

16. In paragraph 78 of the Report the Commission recommend that, in admitting schools to the privilege of sending up their boys for the Entrance Examination, the Universities should be guided by the Education Department and should recognize only those schools which have obtained the recognition of the Department under the rules for the time being in force. Exception has been taken to this proposal in the case of unaided private schools, on the ground that it would amount to an undue interference with their freedom of action and would tend to reduce the school education of each Province to a dead level of uniformity. It is at the same time admitted that before recognizing such schools the University must satisfy itself as to their conduct, efficiency and discipline, and the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Banerjee observes with much force that "the University has no adequate machinery for ascertaining these matters, and even if it were to determine the question of recognition of a school for itself, it must depend upon the Director of Public Instruction for information." This being so, it appears

to the Governor General in Council that the objects which the Commission have in view will be sufficiently attained if it is laid down that no school shall be recognized unless the local Education Department can certify that it conforms, not with the departmental rules, which may not be in all respects applicable, but with rules framed by the Syndicate for this purpose. Under this arrangement the recognition or non-recognition of a school will be the act of the University, and the functions of the Education Department will be limited to placing before the University the information requisite to enable it to exercise its controlling authority. I am to ask whether this suggestion commends itself to

the Governor in Council
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor
you

17. The recommendations of the Commission for the better and more scientific teaching of law are set forth in paragraphs 118—122 of their Report and are examined in paragraphs 27—30 of the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Banerjee's Note of Dissent. They have attracted a good deal of criticism which has not always rested upon a full understanding of the Commission's proposals. It seems

The teaching of law. to be supposed that the Commission wish to confine the teaching of law to Central

Colleges established in the University towns, and that they recommend the abolition of all independent institutions, and more especially of the various law classes and law departments attached to Arts Colleges. This is an entire misapprehension. No such centralization, and no such monopoly were contemplated by the Commission, nor would so sweeping a change commend itself to the Government of India. That some reform is called for in the interest of a branch of education which is of peculiar importance in India will, the Governor General in Council believes, be generally admitted. No one will attempt to justify a system under which it is possible for the legal education of students to be entrusted to a single teacher who is supposed to deliver formal lectures on all the subjects required for the degree of Bachelor of Law, while no library is provided for the students to consult, and no attempt is made to ascertain by means of essays or exercises how far they have assimilated the modicum of information that the Lecturer is capable of imparting. That teaching of this kind is not teaching at all is, indeed, admitted in substance by those who argue in defence of the present system that the students do not go to law lectures to learn law, but in order to obtain the certificate required by the University of having attended so many lectures, and that they can master all their subjects in six months' private reading.

18. The Government of India are disposed to think that the principles which have been suggested in the case of second grade colleges may be found to be equally applicable to the case of the law classes and departments. Efficiency should be strictly insisted on up to the point to which they teach, and, that once secured, their teaching should be accepted as part of the course which the candidates must undergo. Institutions which comply with this essential condition will be entitled to be treated as "centres of *bonâ fide* legal teaching" and will be able to obtain affiliation to the University in law. As an illustration of what is meant by *bonâ fide* legal teaching, the Commission refer to the case of the Aligarh College where it is recognized that one teacher cannot do justice to all the subjects comprised in the law course, and the Professor is assisted by a small staff of local practitioners, old students of the college. Local teaching of this kind, provided always that it comes up to an approved standard, reduces the cost of a legal education to the students of the locality, and need not be condemned because it necessarily falls short of the higher ideal aimed at in a Central College which is intended to serve as a model to all similar institutions in the Province. The same principle applies in the main to the colleges affiliated in law which are situated in University towns. Some of these, notably the Calcutta colleges, command the services of teachers who are well qualified in point of learning. The question for them will be whether they will co-operate in the creation of a Central College, or will elect to retain their independence and to maintain a *bonâ fide* centre of legal teaching within their own walls. At the same time, the Government of India are inclined to agree that, as in the case of Arts, a Central Law College, with fees pitched at a rate commensurate with the commercial value of the education imparted, should be established at each

University centre, and, if necessary, by Government. But its object should be to serve as a model; and it should possess no monopoly other than its own merits may secure to it.

19. I am to ask for ^{the opinion of} ~~the Governor in Council~~ ^{the Governor in Council} ~~His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor~~ ^{your opinion} on the proposals of the Commission on this subject and their application to the circumstances of ^{Madras} ~~the Bombay Presidency~~ ^{Bengal} ~~etc.~~. In particular I am to enquire as to the desirability of establishing a Central College of Law and the possibility of making it self-supporting. Where a Law College already exists, the Government of India would be glad to be informed what action should be taken to bring its teaching and equipment up to the standard laid down by the Commission and to make it in every respect a model institution of its kind.

20. In paragraphs 33-43 of the Report the Commission refer to the defects in the Senates of the Universities as now constituted and propose a variety of reforms. Their proposals under this head are criticised by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Banerjee (paragraphs 2-8 of his Note) who expresses entire agreement in the opinion entertained almost unanimously by the witnesses who were examined by the Commission that the present Senates have become unwieldy bodies by reason of their consisting of unduly large numbers of Fellows, all of whom are not qualified or not inclined to take part in the work of a University. But while admitting that the Senates must be reduced to more reasonable dimensions with only qualified members, Mr. Banerjee is unable to accept the method of reduction recommended by his colleagues and puts forward an alternative scheme which is explained at length in his note.

21. It will be seen from paragraph 33 of the Report that academic opinion is practically at one in holding that the existing Senates are too large, and that steps must be taken to reduce the number of Fellows, to raise the standard of qualification, and to secure more regular attention to University business. The Government of India agree in accepting the principles affirmed by the consensus of so many competent authorities. But in giving effect to these principles they have no desire to enforce compliance with a rigidly uniform plan. His Excellency in Council fully recognizes that the Indian Universities have developed on independent lines, and have formed traditions of their own, and that the differences which have thus arisen may properly be taken into consideration in settling the details of their constitution within the limit of the broad principles already accepted. I am accordingly to ask for an expression of ^{the Governor in Council} ~~His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor~~ ^{your opinion} (i) as to the adequacy of the number of Fellows

proposed by the Commission for the Senate of the ^{Madras} ~~Bombay~~ ^{Calcutta} ~~Allahabad~~ ^{Punjab} University; (ii) as to the proportion of Fellows to be elected in the newly constituted Senate, (iii) as to the persons by whom the privilege of election should be exercised; (iv) as to the period for which a Fellowship should in future be tenable, with special reference to the apprehension, which the Government of India do not share, that a five years' tenure will not be favourable to independence; (v) as to the best method of securing the regular attendance of Fellows at meetings of the Senate. In this last matter it has been suggested that the precedent of the Indian Museum Act might be followed, and that any Fellow who failed to attend for a year should be liable at the discretion of the Chancellor to be removed from the Senate. All the above are questions upon which the Government of India have no desire or intention to surrender their final responsibility, but upon which they desire fully to consult local opinion before exerting it.

22. The Government of India desire to add some further observations on the important question of the election of Fellows. In 1891 the privilege of election on a limited scale was conceded by Lord Lansdowne to the graduates of the Calcutta University. This was admittedly an experiment; and that phrase was applied to it by Lord Lansdowne both in official letters and in public speech. No pledge of continuance was given, and the exercise of the privilege was subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council to whom the names of the

Fellows elected are submitted for final sanction. The same privilege was extended somewhat later under similar conditions to the Universities of Madras and Bombay. In the Universities of Allahabad and Lahore the Act of Incorporation provides for the election of Fellows by the Senate, subject to the approval of the Chancellor. The Commission propose that the privilege experimentally conferred upon the older Universities should be retained, and that power should further be taken to introduce election by the Senates in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, and election by graduates at Allahabad and Lahore. The Government of India are prepared to accept the proposals of the Commission, but it must be borne in mind that these involve a very liberal concession and a substantial advance in the direction of popular representation. In the case of the older Universities a privilege hitherto conditional and tentative will now receive statutory recognition, while in the others the constituent authority will be empowered to place the existing practice on a wider and more popular basis.

23. Where the graduates are to elect, the composition of the electorate will require careful consideration. In paragraph 40 of their Report the Commission propose that the electors should be graduates of five years' standing. In making this recommendation the Commission seem to have been influenced by the precedent of the English Universities, and the Government of India entertain some doubts whether their proposal would not result in the creation of an electorate of unwieldy dimensions, scattered over a vast area of country, devoid of any common ground of action or opportunities for consultation, and therefore peculiarly liable to be led astray by the arts of the canvasser and the wire-puller. It is doubtless possible that the rule as to registration on payment of an annual fee, suggested in paragraph 55 of the Report, would tend to restrict the number of graduates qualified to vote, and that the rules for election might be so framed as to operate in the same direction, while it may also be urged that as election will take place by Faculties, the Faculty of Arts is the only one in which an unduly large electorate need be apprehended. But after giving their full weight to these considerations, His Excellency in Council is still disposed to think that the Commission's proposals go too far, and that the better plan would be to adopt the Bombay system and to restrict the right of voting to the following three classes :—

- (a) Graduates, of whatever standing, who have obtained the highest existing degree in any faculty ;
- (b) graduates, of whatever standing, who have obtained two degrees, one of which must be in the Faculty of Arts ;
- (c) graduates, of not less than ten years' standing, who have obtained only one degree.

24. The Government of India approve of the suggestion that a register of graduates should be kept up in each University, that an annual fee should be paid by those whose names and addresses are entered in it, and that persons whose names are not on the register should not be allowed to vote. The amount of the fee might, it is suggested, be fixed at Rs. 2. The Commission make no mention of the method of voting, but it is understood that they are in favour of continuing the existing system of voting papers. This no doubt has grave disadvantages in the opening which it gives for canvassing and organized pressure, but, having regard to the scattered character of the electorate, His Excellency in Council is disposed to think that these disadvantages are on the whole outweighed by the greater evils which would ensue if the right of election became the virtual monopoly of the residents in the capital towns. I am to invite expression of ^{the opinion of} ~~the Governor in Council~~ ^{His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor} ~~your opinion~~ on the suggestions detailed above.

25. I am next to draw attention to the courses in Arts and Science which are outlined in paragraph 117 of the ^{Courses of teaching.} Report. Here it may be explained that in these and their other proposals relating to teaching, the Commission must not be understood to recommend that the courses of studies in all Universities should be arranged on a uniform plan. They have rather endeavoured to state the principles by which University authorities should be guided in such matters, to draw

attention to the defects which they have observed in methods of teaching, and to indicate the steps which should be taken to simplify and complete the programme of instruction. In pursuance of this view of the matter, which has the cordial assent of the Government of India, it has been suggested that, owing to the metaphysical and introspective bent of the Indian mind, the intellectual discipline which is the object of all University teaching can perhaps be better imparted by substituting History for deductive Logic and elementary Psychology in the intermediate course, and Geography for Political Economy in the B. A. course. There seems to be positive advantage in a suggestion which will tend to attract the Indian mind to the study of the concrete phenomena of society, politics and the natural world rather than to abstract thought or philosophical investigation. On similar grounds, while recognising the difficulties which at present attend instruction in Science, and the unsatisfactory nature of much of the school teaching in the subject, the Government of India are of opinion that it is of the greatest value, as bringing the student into contact with the practical facts which surround him. Moreover, as industrial development by means of native capital advances in India, the demand for scientific training among natives of the country will inevitably increase, and the Government of India would regret any changes which might tend to discourage them from turning their attention to these branches of study, I am to ask for the opinion of the Governor in Council His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on the subject.

your opinion

26. In paragraph 51 (b) of their Report the Commission propose that the Director of Public Instruction should be *ex-officio* a member and Vice Chairman of the Syndicate. I am to enquire whether concerning this proposal, or whether they desire(s) to suggest some alternative arrangement, such as that the Vice-Chairman of the Syndicate should be elected for the year, or should be appointed for the same period by the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor.

27. In paragraphs 163 and 164 of their Report the Commission discuss the question of the age limit for matriculation and arrive at the conclusion that on the whole it will be sufficient to fix the minimum limit of age at 15 as has recently been recommended by a Committee of the Senate at Calcutta. They consider that this limit should be adopted at all Universities. Their recommendation in favour of a minimum limit of 15 seems to rest to some extent on the ground that if 16 were adopted, a medical student, whose course of study is necessarily a prolonged one, would not be able to obtain his degree or diploma until he was 23.

28. The Government of India are unable to admit that the convenience of the comparatively small class of medical students should be permitted to override the educational interests of the students at large. And it appears to them that the natural precocity of the Indian youth, the deplorable physical and mental consequences of over-pressure upon young boys, and the dangers attending their premature entry upon collegiate life, furnish weighty arguments in favour of fixing the minimum age at which a candidate may present himself for examination at 16 rather than 15. The Commission have shown that if a continuous record of a boy's age is maintained from the time when he first goes to school, there will be little difficulty in guarding against the evasion of the rule. It may be added that the inducement to overstate age with the object of matriculating earlier would be greatly reduced if it were made an absolute rule that any declaration of age for public purposes, express or implied, should, in the case of Government servants, be deemed conclusive, and that no revision of such a declaration should be allowed to be made at a later period for any such purpose as avoiding compulsory retirement from the service. I am to ask for the opinion of the Governor in Council His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on the general question on the minimum age to be adopted and as to the desirability of prohibiting any alteration in the recorded ages of Government servants.

29. In paragraph 78 of the Report the Commission point out that their Admission of private students to examinations proposals as to the affiliation of colleges and the recognition of schools will involve a revision of the rules in regard to the admission of private students to

University Examinations. In paragraphs 166—68 they examine this question more fully. As regards candidates for matriculation, they suggest the general adoption of the rule in force at Calcutta which requires every private student to produce a certificate from the Educational Inspector of the circle in which he lives to the effect that it is reasonably probable that he will pass the University Examination. In the case of the Intermediate Examination and the examination for the degree of B. A. or B. Sc., the Commission recommend that private students should be admitted only by an order of the Senate, to be justified by reasons recorded in each case at the time of making the order. The Government of India think it clearly desirable that, so far as the Entrance Examination is concerned, some provision should be made for the admission of private students. But they doubt whether it is advisable or convenient to impose on Government Inspectors the duty of testing such students, and they are disposed to think that a certificate from the head master of a recognized school of suitable status might be accepted as sufficient. After matriculation students should as far as possible, receive their training in the colleges of the Universities, and the Government of India agree in thinking that exemptions from this rule should very rarely be allowed. It seems to them, however, that the proposal to refer all such cases to the Senate is somewhat out of proportion to their importance, and is inconsistent with the position which it is proposed to assign to the Syndicate. I am to invite an expression of

the opinion of the Governor in Council
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on these points.

30. The question of introducing or continuing a separate Honours' Course is one of some difficulty. The Commission discuss it in paragraph 173 and recommend with some hesitation that there should be no separate course for Honours, but that the examination for the degree of M. A. should be regarded as the Honours' Examination. In arriving at this conclusion they seem to have been mainly influenced by the fact that the introduction of Honours' courses at Calcutta has depreciated the pass degree of B. A. The Commission were, it is understood, of opinion that the Indian Colleges do not at present possess the staff and resources requisite to enable them to make adequate arrangements for both Honours' men and pass men. They feared that if the Calcutta system were extended generally, the best teachers in a college would concentrate their efforts on the Honours' men, and that the general standard might be lowered in consequence. The advocates of Honours' courses are found for the most part among those who favour the early specialization of studies, while the Commission consider that an Indian student is not fit to take up a special subject until he has finished his B. A. course. On the other side it may be said that it is possible to attach too much weight to the alleged depreciation of the pass degree. The more that degree declines in value, the more will men resort to the Honours' course, and the greater will be the distinction between the ambitious and the inert or indifferent student which it is the object of all education to accentuate. The suggestion, that the M. A. Examination should be regarded as the Honours' course, meets the case only of the small minority who go on to that degree, and the Governor General in Council sees no reason why the great body of students who do not proceed beyond the B. A. degree should all be included in one and the same category if some of their number desire the opportunity of showing that they have attained a somewhat higher standard. It has been suggested that this legitimate ambition might be satisfied by dividing the B. A. Examination into three classes, the standard of marks demanded for inclusion in the first and second classes being high enough to constitute a real distinction, while the third class would comprise the large number of students who merely qualify for a pass. The highest rank of Honours would still be reserved for the M. A. Examination. I am to ask for

the views of the Governor in Council
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on these questions.

31. The question of the effect of the Commission's proposals on the financial resources of the Universities and colleges is examined in paragraphs 189—194 of the Report. The Government of India agree in thinking that the changes

proposed by the Commission, if carried out in anything approaching entirety, will impose upon the Universities fresh burdens, while at the same time they will probably reduce one of their chief sources of revenue by diminishing the number of students who will pay fees for permission to appear at the Entrance Examination. Unless, therefore, the financial position of the Universities can be materially strengthened by raising the fees for examinations, by contributions from colleges towards the cost of advanced teaching, and by assistance from private benefactors or from Government, the prospect of thorough reforms being effected must be indefinitely postponed. I am accordingly to ask for a full expression of ^{the Governor in Council} ~~His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor~~ ^{your opinion} (i) as to the possibility of raising the fees for examination, (ii) as to the likelihood of substantial contributions towards the advancement of higher education being forthcoming from private sources, (iii) as to the extent to which aid can properly be given by Government; the form which it should take, whether that of a direct subsidy, of lending the services of Professors, or of providing equipment; and as to the measure of control which Government should exercise in each of these cases.

32. In the foregoing paragraphs only those recommendations of the Commission have been discussed which the Government of India feel some hesitation about accepting in their entirety, or which, either from their intrinsic importance, or because of the special attention which they have attracted, it seemed undesirable to pass over in silence. Of those that have not been noticed, while some are definite proposals for reform, many are counsels which will no doubt carry that weight with the Universities to which the distinguished qualifications of their authors, and the special attention which they have given to the subject, entitle them. It is enough to say here that they have the general approval and support of the Government of India. There are certain points special to particular Provinces with which it has not been thought desirable to encumber this letter; and on these the Local Governments concerned will be separately addressed.

33. I am now to invite ^{the Governor in Council} ~~His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor~~ ^{your opinion} upon the various points that have been raised in the present letter, as well as upon the general recommendations of the Commission, in so far as these appear to ^{His Excellency in Council} ~~His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor~~ ^{you} to call for separate or special notice.

I have the honour to be,

सत्यमेव जयते

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

H. H. RISLEY,

Offg. Secretary to the Government of India.